

Paul L. Anderson, February 1, 1947.  
 William C. Carber, February 1, 1947.  
 Rubin E. Young, Jr., February 1, 1947.  
 Fred J. Michalson, February 1, 1947.  
 Richard C. Green, February 1, 1947.  
 James B. Reynolds, February 1, 1947.  
 Wesley J. Quamme, February 1, 1947.  
 William C. Akers, February 1, 1947.  
 Philip S. Bell, February 1, 1947.  
 Donald D. Davison, February 1, 1947.  
 Ivan C. McLean, February 1, 1947.  
 Edward G. Taylor, February 1, 1947.  
 Louis E. Price, February 1, 1947.  
 Franklin F. Bohik, February 1, 1947.  
 Samuel H. Yearta, August 22, 1948.  
 Russell W. Lentner, August 22, 1948.  
 William H. Yates, August 22, 1948.

**TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED**

William C. Wallace, January 15, 1947.  
 Henry G. Cassel, January 15, 1947.  
 Harley B. Shank, January 15, 1947.  
 Raymond M. Miller, January 15, 1947.  
 Charles A. Haley, January 15, 1947.  
 Everett B. Kopp, January 15, 1947.  
 Philip G. Ledoux, January 15, 1947.

**TO BE PROFESSOR, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1942**

Robert E. Reed-Hill.

**TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED**

Elvin C. Hawley, June 5, 1943.  
 Emery H. Joyce, June 5, 1943.  
 Frank McLaughlin, June 14, 1943.  
 Allan V. Falkenberg, June 24, 1943.  
 Russel O. Foster, July 7, 1943.  
 Frank T. Burtie, July 29, 1943.  
 Arnold J. Larsen, December 1, 1943.  
 Lionel H. DeSanty, December 1, 1943.

**TO BE LIEUTENANTS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED**

David H. Douglas, May 15, 1943.  
 Theron H. Gato, May 15, 1943.  
 Paul F. Foye, July 1, 1944.

**TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED**

George A. Philbrick, March 1, 1944.  
 Henry W. Stinson, Jr., March 1, 1944.  
 John W. Day, January 1, 1947.  
 Thomas G. Condon, January 1, 1947.  
 Maurice W. Tichen, January 1, 1947.  
 Leo M. Bracken, January 1, 1947.  
 Paul S. Hofmeister, January 1, 1947.  
 Albert P. Hartt, Jr., January 1, 1947.  
 George E. Tooloose, January 1, 1947.  
 William E. Sale, January 1, 1947.  
 Andrew B. Christensen, January 1, 1947.  
 Harold A. French, August 22, 1948.  
 Sam Plisichio, September 15, 1948.

**TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH**

Walter J. Felton	Charles D. Zettler
Harry G. Kosky	Frank A. Klafs
Richard W. Bagnell	Hugh C. McCaffrey
Edward P. Sawyer	Owen B. Smith
Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr.	Eric G. Grundy
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.	Merle L. Harbourt
Jerry Komorech	Harold L. Appleton
Enoch A. Poulter	Gordon Crymes
Douglas D. Vander Meer	William A. McCreary
	Francis J. Bell

**TO BE ENSIGNS, DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH**

Robert E. Ogin  
 Roger J. Dahlby  
 Nelson W. Allen

**TO BE PROFESSOR (TEMPORARY), WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 1, 1944**

Raymond J. Perry

**TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1943**

Carl A. Anderson

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Love divine that stoops to human needs, hear us when we call. We come to Thee with our cares, our problems, and our limitations.

We ask for wisdom and for grace that this day may be fruitful with good works for our country. Our land cannot fulfill its great mission without reverence for those institutions which make secure its perpetuity—reverence for authority, for law, for Thy church of whatever name, and for the rights of the individual.

Do Thou regard our prayer, as we pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 3, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today to consider the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, that all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein be waived, and that there shall be not to exceed 2 hours of debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the ranking minority member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does that include also that the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. It will be read under the 5-minute rule in the regular way?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That was not included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. That automatically follows. My unanimous-consent request provided for 2 hours of general debate. Of course, after that, if it is necessary, consideration under the 5-minute rule will follow.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object to the request, and I trust there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean today, or when?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is for today. It is just to permit a brief meeting to report out formally the bill for the consideration of which unanimous consent was just obtained.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If they have a bill on the floor they ought to be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just so they can meet and report the bill out officially.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### DISASTER RELIEF

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
 House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on February 3, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 136) entitled "Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on February 3, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on February 3, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on February 3, 1949, he did on that day sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

## TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the events that have transpired during the past few days at the anti-Christian trials in Hungary should awaken the whole world to the true menace of communism.

While we all have great compassion for His Eminence, the cardinal, and his codefendants, at the same time we realize that something bigger than any individual or group of individuals is being drawn through the Red furnace. Here is the final struggle. Here it will be decided whether the conduct of men and nations in the future will be governed by a civilization that traces its beginnings to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount or whether the governing philosophy shall spring from irreligion, paganism, materialism, and lust.

Mankind must decide once and for all whether the pernicious doctrine of Marx and Lenin with its godless philosophy rejecting the dignity of man is to be the rule of conduct for the world. If we are to accept this immorality, then civilization is through and the anti-Christ has triumphed. No longer will there be any such thing as a free man with a free mind. No longer will there be such a possession as human dignity. No longer will there be such a thing as honor and word between men and nations. Courts of justice will be cesspools of iniquities. The established order of life will be anarchy.

Since this is the future that the Communists would foster upon us and our children, let us quickly accept their brazen challenge. Let Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, all of us whose social and political philosophy springs from a common source, march under the one banner—civilization—to battle until the death of the monster that would destroy morality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has expired.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is detained in his district on business. I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted leave of absence for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include three articles pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty, notwithstanding the fact that the estimate

of the Public Printer is that matter will cost an additional \$213.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today while general debate is in process, during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to receive that request, but the Chair is not going to receive many requests for committees to sit during the sessions of the House hereafter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio message by Evangelist Dale Crowley.

Mr. KARST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a resolution adopted by the Illinois House of Representatives.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by his colleague [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

## INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHARITABLE, RELIGIOUS, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will raise the limitation for charitable, religious, and educational contributions from 15 percent to 20 percent.

Under the existing law, gifts to charitable, religious, and other institutions are deductible only to the extent that they do not exceed 15 percent of a taxpayer's income.

My bill raises this limit to 20 percent, and thus encourages more contributions.

The loss in revenue will be inconsequential. The bill will encourage private contributions, and thus lessen the demand from the Federal Government for additional grants. I feel that we ought to do all we can to encourage pri-

vate contributions to our schools, colleges, charities, and religious institutions.

The bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of intergovernmental relations.

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill in which every Member of the Congress and all other persons concerned with efficient and effective government should be keenly interested. This bill provides for the establishment of a temporary bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in the United States, with attention directed especially to the serious fiscal problems with which all levels of government are now so sorely beset.

I want to make it unmistakably clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am fully cognizant of the fact that with the development of our great Nation government at all levels must assume greater responsibilities with respect to the general welfare of the people. The purpose of my bill, however, is to study these needs and to settle upon and establish a logical and equitable pattern or plan by which government, with a proper division of functions and authority, may best discharge its responsibilities to the people.

It is my earnest hope and my request that Members of both Houses of the Congress, and regardless of political affiliation, will join with me in sponsoring this critically needed legislation.

## UNITED STATES HELP TO CHINA

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the situation in China has reached another critical hour of decision in which the United States cannot be anything but the deciding element as the Central Government will not be able to continue its resistance to and battle against the Communist forces without our help. Granted that China's vastness gives seeming strength to the argument behind the questions: Do you want to bankrupt the United States? Where will you get the money and the goods? But how can we who have declared to the world that we will help those countries that fight for their freedom fail the greatest of them all, especially when so very little will do so very much?

Are we still so naive, so unable to recognize the Communist propaganda to



which we are so subtly subjected for what it is? There is no shadow of a doubt about the nature of this army that has reached the Yangtse River, nor of the land reformers with them. They are regular offshoots of Moscow, spreading chaos as they take over. Yet people in high places try to tell us otherwise.

What area in the world is more important to peace, to freedom, and so to the United States as China? What area is more important to Soviet plans for world control? There is no country that has suffered so much from the vacillations and mistakes of our changing policies and our ignorance than this great land of China. Are we going to fail her in this extremity? And more than that, are we going to fail ourselves?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on the machine-tool industry and national defense.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Col. Charles L. Hall, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, January 30, 1948.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Chancellor Mallott, of Lawrence, Kans.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a Richmond paper.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast he made over the Mutual network last Thursday.

#### OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to remind the House of the great need for additional security for our elder citizens, and to request that action should be taken at once to provide better old-age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a majority of the people in our respective districts are expecting us to give immediate attention to this matter. Both major political parties committed themselves, during the national campaign last year, to provide adequate old-age pensions and social security. Both parties,

and perhaps nearly every spokesman for each party, stated time and again that our old-age pensions should be increased. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan matter. Republicans get just as hungry, and just as cold, as Democrats, and vice versa. Republicans and Democrats are working together in this Congress to do something about this pressing matter. There are many questions, Mr. Speaker, on which we may disagree. But on this question there is no partisanship. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been in session here over a month. We are waiting for committee action for work on this floor. Why not bring forth a bill to provide a decent, uniform, American old-age pension? Why not act on it now? I think we all agree that the need is very acute. It is entirely justified. It is not a partisan question. Then why not let us have action? In the last session of Congress we acted with rapidity to appropriate billions of dollars to afford relief to the stricken people of the world. Why cannot we take action with equal rapidity to provide for our aged people who in the declining years of their lives need our help.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we have action now?

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by the Iowa Creameries Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TALLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I first ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the session of the House providing there is general debate or the House is not in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; for how long?

Mr. LESINSKI. For this week, for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate only if the House is in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the House is in session and there is general debate.

Mr. LESINSKI. During general debate, and I want to provide also when the House is not in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT RE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce that we will continue hearings on the minimum-wage bill this week, including Wednesday. On Thursday we are going into executive session and will attempt to bring out H. R. 858, dealing with the question of overtime on overtime, which is a burning question. We want to forestall any coal strikes that may be pending now or which may happen in the future.

#### VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew my invitation to Members of the House who desire to be heard on the pending pension bill to appear before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow morning at 10:30 a. m. or to send whatever statements they have to make.

I know there is a great hue and cry against pensioning the old men who went through the First World War and who have now reached the same age, and in the same condition, that Spanish-American veterans had reached when they were pensioned and the same age and in the same condition as the veterans of the Civil War were when they were pensioned.

If we can feed and clothe every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu out of the American taxpayer's pocket and continue to finance the satellite states of Soviet Russia that are dedicated to the destruction of this Government, then we can certainly look after our own veterans, the men who fought the Nation's battles in time of war and sustained its institutions in time of peace, and who are now old and unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If we take care of all of these countries the gentleman is talking about, from New York to Timbuktu, how are we going to be able to take care of our own veterans? We are going to have a hard time taking care of the American soldiers if we take care of all of these foreign countries.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, get on my side and stay there. I am opposed to financing every other country in the

world, and leaving our own disabled veterans out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by the pastor of a Presbyterian church.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include memorials from the Montana House of Representatives and Senate urging the early construction of the Yellow Tail Dam.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former attorney general of Maryland.

Mr. GILMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief article from a national magazine.

Mr. GORE (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Denver Post.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article in reference to Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper articles, editorials, and a speech.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that I should make my first speech on the floor of this House in protest against what appears to be one of the most flagrant violations of human rights in modern history. I rise to reflect the indignation and sorrow of thousands of loyal Americans in my district at the cruelty and travesty on justice of the so-called trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. I shall urge and support a resolution of inquiry as to why our Government should not denounce

the cruelty, inhumanity, and injustice of that trial in the name of the rights of man.

#### THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up for consideration House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.*

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, having had under consideration this concurrent resolution, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

For the benefit of the Members who have come to the House since the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for the benefit of those of us who were here but whose memories, like mine, are clouded, I would briefly review the original legislation and the reasons that are persuasive of the proposed change. The Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress filed a report during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress strongly recommending a provision whereby the House, soon after its organization each session, could have a comprehensive and clear picture of the proposed expenditures and the probable income of the Government. It would, perhaps, be helpful to quote briefly from that report:

Control of the purse for all Federal governmental activities is one of the major functions of Congress. Numerous witnesses appeared and recommended various changes designed to strengthen the position of Congress in relation to fiscal affairs.

These recommendations stressed the need for the adoption each year of an over-all fiscal policy that would consider both the income and expenditures of Government. It was pointed out that the control over revenues and expenditures is divided not only between the House and Senate, but also within each House between its revenue and appropriations committees. Neither of the two appropriations committees imposes any over-all limitations upon its total appropriations before the individual supply bills are voted on by the Houses. Nor do they attempt to coordinate appropriations with revenues so as to fix an over-all fiscal policy for the year.

With this divided authority existing not only between the appropriation committees of each House, but also among their many subcommittees, and among the revenue-raising committees, how could Congress have a general fiscal policy or follow it if it had one?

Other recommendations called not only for strengthening the staffs of the important appropriation committees and their subcommittees, but made several suggestions for basic changes in methods of controlling expenditures, improving auditing procedures, and developing better administrative management in Government agencies.

Your committee agrees that primary responsibility rests with Congress to improve legislative control over governmental expenditures and that means must be provided to permit a closer scrutiny of them,

and not only by the committees charged with this duty but also by the individual Members and Congress itself.

Your committee believes that Congress has not adequately equipped itself to resist the pressure of departments and agencies in behalf of larger expenditures. We have equipped the agencies with ample funds to collect and present evidence to support their appeal for larger sums or to forestall reductions. But we have failed to implement Congress with adequate facilities for scrutinizing these justifications.

It becomes increasingly difficult for a Member of Congress to maintain a clear picture of expenditures and income, and because of this difficulty it is often impossible to make the intelligent decisions on legislation that our responsibilities require.

The House very wisely adopted a provision in the Reorganization Act—now Public Law 601—which requires:

The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$—."

Subsequent to the adoption of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations found it impractical, if not impossible, with the information at hand, to intelligently comply with the act of February 15. They were relegated to a speculative figure which could not be helpful to the Congress. During the last session of Congress considerable heat was generated as a result of an effort to comply with the above provision, and because of the haste and the lack of adequate information the figures arrived at provoked considerable criticism.

It is unnecessary, I think, at this time to consider this from a political standpoint, but it is perhaps inevitable, and while there will be no serious opposition to adoption of this resolution there will likely be considerable debate about the manner in which the legislative budget report was handled during the Eightieth Congress and is presently being ap-



proached. Certainly, however, it is very impractical for the joint committee to bring in a conclusive and accurate report by February 15. This is the experience of both parties. The date should be set back.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] introduced this resolution, which, as you see, provides that the date of reporting the legislative budget shall be postponed until May 1 of this year. He expresses the hope of the joint committee that by that time a useful and comprehensive report may be brought before the House, outlining a fiscal framework within which we may work.

It is of particular importance to our economy and the proper discharge of the functions of this Congress that we do not totally disregard this important part of the Reorganization Act. The earliest possible date should be agreed upon for the reporting of the legislative budget as set forth in section 138, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As so very ably presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on many occasions, the Congress should not abandon its quest for a sound fiscal policy to guide us in our work. We are attempting by this measure to find a workable date, one that will be timely and useful to the Members of Congress, and we are attempting to give the joint committee an opportunity to work it out in good order.

There can rightfully be no politics in the consideration of this resolution and there should be no opposition to its adoption. I believe that I express the majority view when I say it is in the interest of orderly and effective procedure that we adopt the resolution. Experience alone will permit us to agree upon a permanent, timely date.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to me in connection with this resolution be transferred to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the ranking minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Concurrent Resolution 22 would amend section 138 of the Reorganization Act so as to make the effective date for the filing of the so-called legislative budget for the coming fiscal year May 1.

I think perhaps it may be well for us in considering this legislation to recall just a little bit of recent history. When the Reorganization Act was before the House, the purpose of section 138 was explained rather thoroughly and I think very well by the sponsors of that legislation, to the effect that by filing such a legislative budget or an estimate of receipts and expenditures early in each session of Congress we would then at

least have some figure to shoot at in connection with both revenue raising and tax spending.

In practice, it has worked out that it was rather difficult to make anything like an accurate appraisal of either our revenues or our spending program, because February 15, the day provided in the original act, was rather early. It was impossible in many instances to know what revenues would be coming in, and certainly impossible to know what action Congress might take on the appropriation bills, or even what appropriation bills the Committee on Appropriations might report. As a result, back in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, in 1947, no agreement was reached by the joint committee set up to create and to submit this legislative budget as to what the budget should be.

The joint committee was severely and soundly and roundly criticized—actually denounced, as it were—for failing to meet the requirements of the Reorganization Act. The Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress was, in fact, openly accused of trying to sabotage and destroy the Reorganization Act. The leader of that denunciation, the man who made, should I say, the most rabid speeches against those charged with the responsibility of attempting to work out a legislative budget, was none other than my very good friend and namesake, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who rather peculiarly now happens to be the author of this House concurrent resolution—wanting to do the very thing for which he condemned his Republican colleagues in the House just two short years ago. It is very, very peculiar what changes just a little bit of time will make in people's viewpoints and attitudes. If I may let you in on more or less of a legislative secret—and I do not want to call it that because I am sure the gentleman did not mean to be secretive—now and then humorous things often happen, even in that terrible Committee on Rules, which has been chastised recently by the Congress.

By mistake, Mr. Majority Leader—for I presume it was by error, and I am sure also that it was not your responsibility in any way—House Concurrent Resolution 13, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, was presented to the committee. Lo and behold, it provided to just do away entirely with the legislative budget, and not to have any at all, or to just strike out or repeal that section of the Reorganization Act. If I may get confidential with my colleagues, I am not so sure but that that is not the best way to meet the situation. I am certain of one thing: it is the most honest way of meeting it, because when you pass the pending resolution, all you are doing is circumventing—as I am certain the gentleman from Oklahoma will tell you if he speaks on the measure—the intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act by saying, "Oh, we will set up a budget after we know what the tax income is going to be, and after we have passed out most of the appropriation bills and have decided what we are going to spend."

Well, that was not the idea, purpose, or intent behind this provision of the

Reorganization Act, I am sure. The purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act, section 138, was to at least attempt to hold down public spending and to hold down taxes and to give the Congress an opportunity, before it acts, to take an over-all look at the annual great, gigantic spending program to see what it is we are going to spend and what we are going to have available to spend.

It is proposed here to make the date May 1, and that is after the horse is out of the barn, as it were.

I hope and I believe it would just be a matter of fair play, if I may express it that way, that the gentleman from Missouri who is the sponsor of this legislation will offer his apology to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—and I am sorry that Mr. Knutson is not here—and to all those who were charged with this responsibility back in the Eightieth Congress, and say to them in substance, at least, "Well, boys, I was wrong, and I am sorry that I criticized you, because now that the responsibility is mine, I realize that I cannot meet it any better than you could meet it when it was yours. I am here to admit to you that I was playing just a little bit of politics back in the Eightieth Congress."

Of course, I can understand why the gentleman from Texas said to you that we should not discuss this in a political vein. Of course, I am not discussing it from a political angle. But, nevertheless, it was discussed from a political viewpoint, purely and simply, back in the Eightieth Congress.

Here is No. 2 on the list of peculiar legislative flip flops by our Democratic friends. Oh, I remember somebody keeping score on us, Mr. Majority Leader, back in the Eightieth Congress. So, perhaps it is a good time to set up another score board and to start keeping a little score and a little record. But this is back-pedaling bill No. 2 to come before the House. It is either the third or fourth piece of legislation of any kind which we have had before us. But it is the second bill or resolution that has come before the House that in fact approves something the Eightieth Congress did in connection with some particular piece of legislation. It admits that the Eightieth Congress and those leaders in that Congress who were charged with the responsibility of handling the legislative budget were right at the time they were being so soundly and so roundly criticized by my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

In order that we may have a picture of what is occurring here, I have attempted to describe to you what has gone before, including the peculiar past actions of some of our colleagues. As far as the legislation is concerned, I hope that if we are going to take any action at all we will be absolutely honest and actually do the thing that this resolution attempts to do by circumvention or evasion of the Reorganization Act—just repeal the whole section. We either ought to live up to that section or, if it is not workable, then we ought to have the legislative manhood and womanhood, and honesty of purpose

and forthrightness with the general public, to say, "We have found out that section 138 of the Reorganization Act is not workable, and instead of trying to kid you or mislead you a bit by setting a date so that the legislative budget means nothing, we are just admitting that the section will not work and we are repealing it." That action would be honest and forthright, but what is done, of course, depends upon the wishes and the will of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly said on the floor of the House, and I repeat it, that I consider the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the best Republican politician in the House of Representatives. That does not mean to say that there are not other good ones on that side, but his versatility, of course, is known to all of us who have served with our distinguished friend.

In his remarks he overlooked one important factor, however, that 2 years ago the Democrats attacked the arbitrary manner in which the Republican Party undertook to comply with section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Lest they forget, let me refresh the memory of my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that instead of meeting it in an honest way, as we are meeting it now, his party brought in a resolution calling for a \$6,000,000,000 cut in the budget recommendations. Now, if the Republican leadership had approached it the way we are approaching it, and we had then opposed it, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], would be pertinent. But we took the position that a \$6,000,000,000 cut was arbitrary; that it disregarded the equities and the necessities of specific items included in the President's budget. Of course, every bit of evidence in the Eightieth Congress confirms our position. After the House adopted this arbitrary \$6,000,000,000 cut, and, of course, that was done by the then majority party, the resolution went over to the Senate; and the Senate majority party voted a \$4,500,000,000 cut. Then the resolution went to conference, and of course it never saw the light of day again. At that time when the resolution was reported to the House and was pending in the House if a resolution along these lines had been introduced, a different situation would have existed; and if we Democrats opposed, I repeat, then the gentleman from Ohio in his "nonpolitical" speech that he says he has just made would have been on more tenable grounds. The best answer is that the gentleman himself admits that this is the honest approach to a situation that we know is difficult for both branches of Congress to work out in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act at the present time; to wit, action on or before February 15.

As we construe the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]—and there is no Member of the House more adroit in expression and in drawing the lines of differentiation between logical debate on the proposition

and political argument—the remarks of the gentleman are in complete support of the resolution that is now pending before the House. I respect the gentleman in his further statement that he believes that the time limit should be completely eliminated. That may be so; I am not prepared to agree with that today. I think we ought to have one more year's experience, at least; but certainly in his frank way he has told the House and told the country just how he feels; that it is not a resolution, in his opinion, that goes far enough. I am not prepared to challenge that now; but, in any event, this resolution is based upon the necessities of the situation that confront the Congress; and the gentleman's remarks are certainly in support of the particular resolution, which, so far as this particular year is concerned in determining the budget limit for the fiscal year 1950, is a decided step in the right direction, according to his way of thinking.

I rose, however, to set the record straight and to show that our opposition to the resolution in the first session of the Eightieth Congress was based on the arbitrary cut, and that an approach of this kind would have been an honest one and probably would not have incurred our opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, America today is facing a very serious situation. Federal tax collections from the people of the United States in the current fiscal year will run between \$42,000,000,000 and \$44,000,000,000. State and local tax collections will run nearly \$15,000,000,000, and the total will run somewhere around \$57,000,000,000. The expendable income, money that can be spent by the people, not the gross income that you hear talked about, but the expendable income, is less than \$150,000,000,000. What does this mean? That we are paying today in this country for taxes 35 percent of what is taken in. Is it not about time that we begin to take into consideration what is going on instead of proposing additional taxes to ruin the country?

Mr. Speaker, as far as this particular resolution is concerned, I do not believe it will make the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act work. It could not be made to work last year, although we gave of ourselves all the time that it was possible to give in an effort to make it work satisfactorily. Instead of bringing in a subterfuge like this, I am wondering why the majority of the House does not have the courage to bring in a repealer? Every time that we suggested a reduction in over-all appropriations last year and the year before the spenders—those with special projects and other spenders—began to holler. They said that what we were trying to do was to cut down on particular projects that they had in mind.

Why do we not be honest with the House of Representatives and the people of the United States if we are going to do anything about this matter other than to try to make it work the way the reorganization bill provided? Why do we not

have the courage to bring in a repealer of that provision?

I could not support this proposition when it was up for consideration before. I stated then just how it would work when the bill was on the floor for consideration. Let me ask again, Why do you not have the courage to face the music?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to express my opinion that the postponement of this date for filing the legislative budget until May 1 this year is not in contravention or subterfuge to violate the intent of the legislative budget.

I also would like to answer the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and the distinguished gentleman from New York that we should in all honesty abolish the legislative budget.

In the first place, there is nothing sacred about any date or any particular time mentioned in the Reorganization Act. The Congress is a fluid organization and any Member of Congress must know that no one can possibly write a bill and the Congress cannot pass a bill that must not be looked at in the light of experience and of trial and error.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman misquoted me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not want to do that for the world. I thought I had quoted the gentleman correctly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. My statement was that we should be honest about this, if this will not work, that instead of circumventing the law we should be honest about it and say it will not work and repeal it. We should take one step or the other. We ought to keep it as it is or we ought to repeal it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps I erred and should not have said that the gentleman from Ohio takes the same position as the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has been on record consistently since the legislative budget was first proposed in opposition to any legislative budget idea.

The original date in the Reorganization Act for filing the legislative budget, I believe, was April 15. At the request of the Appropriations Committee of the other body that was moved forward to March 15, then at the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee leaders over here, and in an effort to reach a compromise, it was finally made February 15. So this extension now to a later date more or less bears out the original idea that a quick consideration of the important items of a legislative budget are apt to mislead the country and the Congress on the attainment of a factual and a definite budget that Congress can live within.

So I do not think it is going to hurt the congressional reorganization a bit to postpone the date for this year only and try at a later date—I would much rather have a later date—to get closer to hitting the target of the legislative budget.



The accuracy of the budget is more important than to just keep the February 15 date and miss it by \$6,000,000,000, as was done 2 years ago. If this mechanism of the legislative budget is to work and to be helpful to the country, then I think it must be as nearly accurate as possible in the light of carefully considered congressional estimates on appropriations and on revenue for that year.

I would like to express myself now on the abolishment of the legislative budget. Its abolishment would tear out the second most vital part of the reorganization of Congress. This was one of the principal things that gave hope to the people of the country that Congress would meet its most important task, and that is, the controls over the power of the purse.

People look to Congress as the guardian of the purse strings, and why the gentleman from New York would stand up here and ask that this mechanism be torn out of the Legislative Reorganization Act without giving it a fair trial, I simply cannot understand.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that we did not give it a fair trial last year or the year before?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that the bringing in of a \$6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget on February 15, 2 years ago, was not a fair trial. Even though I was one of the sponsors of the legislative budget, I voted against that \$6,000,000,000 cut, because I knew from my experience it was unrealistic and impossible of attainment.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman really believe in saving a dollar?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do.

Mr. TABER. It is about time somebody did.

Mr. MONRONEY. If you will work and perfect this legislative budget as it was intended to be worked, if you put a staff on the legislative budget and study the budget requests of every single department, and follow from the time the desire of appropriation brings glint into a bureau's eye, and follow that request through the budget office of the President down to the time it comes to Congress, you will be approaching the financial responsibility of the job Congress has to do.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does the gentleman know that the testimony before the subcommittee of the War Department last year developed that they had \$5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years' funds available for expenditure which the President did not include in that very budget the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that we should have the very finest staff that money can employ for the Congress to know and understand every single budget item as it comes from these departments and from the President and the failure of the legislative budget has been largely because we have

not had a proper staff employed for the legislative budget organization.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And \$4,000,000,000 of that amount remains in the Treasury today.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The one thing, I think, that we have to realize as Members of Congress is that there are two ends to every budget:

First. How much are you going to spend; and

Second. How much are you going to take in?

In a simple analysis of legislative budget we ask that the Congress do exactly as every individual in business does, try and estimate his over-all expenditure and his over-all income, and try at one point in our congressional session to put these two important items in focus.

If we ignore the amount of revenue that we are going to have coming in at the time we try and fix an over-all budget ceiling on expenditures, then I think we are ignoring one of the principal tasks of this job. The Committee on Ways and Means before the Civil War used to handle both appropriations and also the matter of taxation, and they had control at both ends of the important fiscal job of Congress.

Now we have two committees operating in an airtight, hermetically sealed compartment. Under the legislative budget they must meet together and discuss the matter of revenue and appropriations. These two items, and their relationships of income and outgo, are problems that the people of the United States want to know and understand.

They want to know how are we going to balance the budget and how much revenue are we going to have to meet the necessary total expenditures?

The legislative budget should not be abolished; it should be made to work.

I do not yield to any man in my opinion of the ability of this great legislative body. We can, if we try, make a sound and reliable budget, just as capably as the executive department can. We only need to put the best efforts forward in this approach to an improved fiscal control by Congress.

I am tired, as one Member, of seeing our appropriations total grow haphazard as the result of many loosely connected subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Our total expenditure figure should be one that is in line with our ability to pay—and only by a legislative budget, taking into consideration both income and outgo, can we do our job.

The suggestion made that May 1 will be too late for any use, is not in line with the facts. A leading member of the Appropriations Committee informed the Rules Committee when this measure was before them, that three-fourths of the appropriations would not have been passed by both Houses before the May 1 date. My own opinion is that not much more than one-third of the money bills will have passed even one House before that date.

It is far more important to set the date forward to May 1 than to abandon the legislative budget. It is more important to change the date than to put up with meaningless budgets hastily arrived at without due consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He said that any business concern wants to determine how much money it has to spend and how it is going to spend it. I agree with him 100 percent on that. But he said so much more that I do not agree with much of his arguments. Those in charge of any business do not wait until they have spent all their money and then come with recommendations for new features to their business. They decide what they have and what they want before they start any venture. Those responsible for the operation of any good, sound, business concern first sit down and try to analyze just how much it is going to cost them to run their business, new things they want in their business, and then find out how much money they have to spend in order to determine just what they can do. They determine it almost to the penny. If they do not have the money themselves, they want to know where they are going to get it, in order that they can carry out the proposals they are going to inculcate into their business. They do not start new improvements to cost great sums without knowing where the money is coming from.

Why is not that the sensible thing for this Government to do? That is what this law as it was adopted was intended to do. The Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and other Members of the House and Senate were to get together and try as best they could to find out exactly what was going to be required in the way of spending for the year, then they were going to analyze the new things they had, that the President had proposed in his messages to Congress and that the Members of Congress were going to propose in way of legislation. If you propose so much legislation that you are not going to have the money to finance it, and you are going to have deficit spending, then is the time to call a halt, and the report of this committee would be a deterrent to deficit spending.

The gentleman says the Members of this Congress are bright enough, smooth enough, and sweet enough that they are not going to ask for a whole lot of things, but every Member of Congress wants to have something for his own district that costs much money. He is more interested in that than he is in the welfare of the country as a whole. At least it looks that way. He wants to see if he can get appropriations through the Committee on Appropriations and through the Congress, because that will help him in his district.

What has been proposed in the President's budget? The President has proposed some new things. Military pay

adjustments are going to require over \$300,000,000. Before we start on that, just remember that you have a \$252,000,000,000 debt. The President has asked for \$41,800,000,000 for next year. He realized that he is not going to get that money, that he is going to be short \$855,000,000 from a balanced budget, when he presented all these requests. Somewhere, somewhere, sometime, you will have to cut the cost of government and the President's recommendations.

This committee ought to come in here with these things and tell us just what we are going to have to cut out. Then we ought to be big enough to say that we are going to have a stable, sound Government, and are not going to spend any more than we have to spend. It would be a deterrent to too much legislation if this committee would come in here and make such recommendations to cut out a lot of the President's recommendations, or recommendations of Members of Congress.

Universal military training as proposed by the President is going to cost anywhere from \$600,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 per year. Changes in the employees' accident compensation rates are going to cost per year from three to four million dollars. Slum clearance and housing are going to take \$210,000,000 to \$545,000,000 additional per year. Research and administration and losses on loans, although there has been no official estimate as to the cost, are thought by some people in Government to run as high as \$2,000,000,000. That is a lot of money.

For Federal aid to education they want \$300,000,000 the first year. The second year it will take \$500,000,000. The third year it will take a billion dollars at the least. That is a lot of money. Where are you going to get it?

The National Science Foundation will take from \$2,000,000 to \$100,000,000 per year. Grain storage will take from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 a year. The international wheat agreement will take from \$55,000,000 to \$70,000,000 a year.

Flood control on Missouri River Basin \$4,000,000, and no one knows the final cost; probably like the TVA, it might be a billion dollars.

Health insurance or socialized medicine will run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Unemployment compensation, higher rates and broadening the base.

Steam power plant on TVA—Government in business competing with private enterprise, \$75,000,000. Oh, foolish legislation and proposals by the President.

Bureau of Reclamation—rehabilitation and betterment as required by the President will take from \$4,000,000 to \$12,000,000 a year.

The construction programs that he has asked for, such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, are to take \$93,000,000 the first year up to a sum total in 7 years of \$3,573,000,000—survey and educational building needs and study for scholarships and fellowships will take a million dollars a year or more.

Then there are grants for scholarships and so on. This thing is enormously important; this ought not to be delayed 1 minute, this report should be here by February 15. It can be done; it should be

done. You ought to defeat this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was very much interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] wherein he suggested that this measure was in complete compliance with the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Being a man of peace and one who loves harmony, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that inasmuch as all of the appropriation bills of the House will probably be through the House by May 1, which would, of course, mean that the budget would mean nothing—in order to be certain that he will know exactly what he is going to do that he might well make this August 1 or September 1, or even January 1 of next year, so that he could be quite certain in knowing just where he was.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who claims the great distinction of being one of the authors of the reorganization bill, in an attempt to justify his position on this resolution, which to my mind very surely represents a desertion of the very principle for which he originally fought, made the remark that the Congress is a fluid body. I am quite sure since he has so characterized all of us collectively as being a fluid body that he would not object to my suggesting that perhaps his position on this matter of the legislative budget is a little fluid.

Let us just take a look at the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Great numbers of right-thinking people in the country thought that the Congress of the United States needed to be streamlined, that it needed to be brought up to date in its procedure. So we in the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Democratic Congress, enacted the Reorganization Act. There were three things principally outstanding in that measure which were supposed to be helpful to the country. One of them was that we were to shrink up the committees from 48 to 19 in the House and make a like reduction in the other body. The second was that we were to give adequate staffing to those committees in order that they might have the benefit of expert advice and not be dependent upon the executive branch of the Government for all of our information. Thirdly, we were to adopt a legislative budget.

The Congress, may I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, is in truth and in fact the guardian of the purse strings of the Nation. The Congress itself was to take 45 days to sit down, the House cooperating with the Senate, to determine first of all what the revenues could reasonably be expected to be during the coming year, and then to say, "Here is what we propose to spend."

It was assumed, I am quite sure, that those targets would be set and that then

the Congress would go to work to try to fit the cloth to the pattern.

Now, what have we already seen? First of all, it fell to the lot of the Eightieth Congress to put the Reorganization Act into effect. I have said before, and what has here transpired today lends additional strength to my statement, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress the provisions of the reorganization bill would never have been put into effect. You would not have had a shrinking up of committees; you would not have provided for an adequate staffing of those committees, and you would not have undertaken to comply with the requirements for a legislative budget.

In the Eightieth Congress we did put the Reorganization Act into effect. We did not change it in any one single essential feature. We strove to comply with all of its provisions, including the legislative budget.

It is true that in the first session the House and Senate did not finally agree in conference, but the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate at least had courage enough to grapple with the problem and to each state its views as to what the revenues would be and what the expenditures should be.

In the second session we did get out a legislative budget. We did say what we expected would be taken in and how much we should cut expenditures. And let me say to the membership, many of whom were not here in the Eightieth Congress, unfortunately, that we not only announced a legislative budget in the second session, but we lived up to that legislative budget, and we saved billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country by cutting out unnecessary waste and extravagance.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Coming back to the statement that I made when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] yielded to me, I have in my possession a detailed statement which I obtained from the War Department after 2 years of work with investigators. This statement shows that the War Department had \$5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years funds available for expenditure at the time when the budget was submitted to the Legislative Budget Committee by the President. That budget which was submitted by the President to the Legislative Budget Committee did not contain this \$5,270,000,000 which was available to the War Department for expenditure. Four billion dollars of that sum remained in the Treasury, either through rescission or refusal to reappropriate. The balance of \$1,270,000,000 was obligated by the War Department. Part of these funds were used by the War Department in building those \$74,000 houses for Army officers in Alaska.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, may I say that in my opinion the legislation before us today is a subterfuge, a face-saving device, calculated to permit my friends on the majority side from meeting the responsibility that they themselves im-



posed on themselves when they had control in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I do not think it is an honest attempt, and this is why it cannot be honest, and the argument of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], amazes me: By May 1, if I understand the timetable correctly, most of the appropriation bills will be through the House of Representatives and will have been acted upon. If that is true, what is the use of kidding ourselves by saying that making this May 1 we are going to make a determination. The fact of the matter is you have not even had a committee meeting to try to arrive at a legislative budget. You have not turned a wheel to try to meet the responsibility that you imposed on yourselves.

May I say further—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot refrain from yielding to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is well informed that in very few sessions have we been able to get out a majority of the appropriation bills, and when we did they would remain in the other body for an additional 2 months; so that there is ample time.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, you see, that is just some more of the earlier apology for this completely indefensible action you are taking here today.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that while action may not be completed in the other body on appropriation bills we over here have the first responsibility on appropriations and we ought to have before us the legislative budget in order that we may proceed to cut the cloth to fit the pattern. If there ever was a time when we ought to have that guidance it is now when we are confronted with demands for additional expenditures of billions and billions of dollars. I am afraid that too many of my Democratic friends are already demonstrating that they have no real intention to cut expenditures or balance the budget. Somewhere a line must be drawn on what we can take out of the economy and not destroy it. If the Democratic majority were not busy welching on its responsibility to determine the legislative budget, a good beginning could be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper excerpts; and to include in 7½-point type remarks made at the time of the adoption of the law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reorganization Act was approved by the President in 1946. It provided for reduction in the number of committees, for increased congressional personnel, for the abolition of investigating committees

and special committees, for the transfer to other agencies of private bills, for the control and registration of lobbyists, for the discontinuance of executive hearings by committees, for committee procedure in the consideration and reporting of bills, and for budgetary control through a joint Committee on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees and the two spending committees of the two Houses.

No action of the Seventy-ninth Congress met with wider acclaim or more general approval. The bill passed both Houses by an overwhelming vote and was warmly endorsed by the press of the Nation.

But from the beginning the statute was singularly ineffective. In no instance, and in no respect, did it realize expectations and in no instance did it achieve the objective for which it had been drafted.

Now in its third year we can look back and appraise its effect in the light of comprehensive experience.

Through the association of frequently the most incongruous jurisdictions, it drastically reduced the 81 standing committees of the House and Senate to 146 subcommittees. As the United Press said, "The Senate instead of having 33 full committees as it had before the consolidation now has 15 committees and God knows how many subcommittees." The Senators who complained of having so many committees meeting at the same time now have more subcommittees meeting at the same time.

The Act was especially intended to eliminate special committees. But special committees have been created by both Houses in violation of both the spirit and letter of the law. The Senate after extended debate began by perpetuating the War Investigating Committee as a special group outside the committees authorized by the Reorganization Act and continued the practice. The House voted 269 to 100 to establish a seven-man committee to study the shortage of newsprint and later voted 270 to 92 to set up a nine-member committee on small business. The Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers with all its onerous duties followed.

So, in effect, this provision of the Reorganization Act which was perhaps stressed as strongly as any in the entire bill has been completely nullified.

It still exerts, however, one untoward effect. There are 47 men now serving in the two Houses, 29 men in the House and 18 in the Senate, who have been deprived of chairmanships which they have earned and to which they are entitled. And the same number of men on the other side of the aisle have been denied ranking minority assignments on committees through the operation of the act. They do the work and carry the responsibilities of a full committee. They have rendered efficient and distinguished service and are entitled to a chairmanship. But submerged in a subcommittee they are denied the recognition which they and their constituencies should have. Under this system able men may come to Congress and work for years and then retire without ever having reached a chairmanship. It is not only unjust to the Mem-

ber but it does not contribute to the best interests of the Congress or the Nation.

And we were to be relieved of "trivia." Section 121 of the Reorganization Act was designed to relieve the membership of the burden of handling private bills. Such bills were to be delegated to administrative and judicial agencies. How has it worked? On the first day of last June the House had passed 187 private bills and 167 public bills. And the House, after 2 years, is still carrying the private calendar and in the last session was calling up private bills every 2 weeks.

The Reorganization Act also carried provisions prohibiting legislation by conference committees, the reporting of bills by a committee without majority vote, dictatorial action of a committee chairman contrary to the wishes of his committee, and similar well-established procedures. All such provisions are mere padding as all of them have been embodied in the law and practice of the House from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

The act banned closed sessions. Open hearings were to be the rule. And yet both the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, for example, have continued closed sessions. I do not recall a single open session by the committee, or any subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations since the law was enacted. Like all other provisions of the act the inhibition of executive sessions is honored by its breach.

Another of the reforms to be instituted by the Reorganization Act was the control of lobbyists. They were to be required to register and in that way the evil was to be eradicated or at least reduced to innocuous proportions. The newspapers report that during the entire Eightieth Congress, and with increasing activity in the Eighty-first Congress, the lobbyist has flourished as a green-bay tree. There are said to be more high-powered, high-priced lobbyists in Washington today with larger expense funds at their disposal than ever before. And so far as can be noted by the casual observer they have not been affected by the Reorganization Act in the slightest.

The National Legionnaire, in commenting on this section of the Reorganization Act, said:

American Legion legislative representatives registering under the new Lobbying Act describe it as a weak and flexible measure denying the public a true picture of expenditures and they proposed legislation requiring complete financial statements such as those furnished by the Legion for decades.

John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director of the American Legion, one of three to register, condemned the section of the act as being a "camouflaged works which is an insult to the intelligence of the American citizen, whom it would deceive."

"This section," Director Taylor charged, "is a farce, which enterprising lobbyists must praise as they gleefully behold the many loopholes."

Although the Reorganization Act was launched with the universal approval and commendation of the press, the failure of the law to effect economy or increased efficiency has been so marked that its most ardent editorial advocates have become critical.

For example, the United States News, which strongly championed its enactment, says:

**BRAKES ON SPEED-UP PROGRAM AS SUBCOMMITTEES RISE, BUDGET LAGS—LITTLE CHANGE IN OUTPUT OF LAWS DESPITE \$5,000,000 A YEAR FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE**

The Eightieth Congress is remodeled and streamlined for efficiency. It has \$5,000,000 a year in new experts and technicians, all sorts of new controls and machinery designed to put lawmaking on a scientific basis. But a careful study of its work indicates that Congress is going along in about the same old way.

An investigation shows:

Legislative output is about on a par with that of other Congresses.

The legislative budget, designed to bind together governmental income and outgo controls, is caught in a dispute and all but forgotten. Appropriation and tax bills are moving as usual.

A streamlined committee system is now filling the Capitol with subcommittees, and, in some cases, this new committee system is adding another layer of red tape to the legislative processes. More red tape, no greater output.

Lobbyists, who were to be controlled, still are busy in committees and at the nightly social affairs of the Capital.

#### BUDGET TANGLE

The legislative budget was designed to bring the spending and taxing committees of Congress together for a study of the Nation's fiscal situation and for agreement upon over-all spending and taxing policies. A figure for total spending would be set and appropriation bills cut to fit that total. Taxes would be fixed accordingly.

But House Republicans demanded a \$6,000,000,000 cut in the budget President Truman submitted, so as to assure tax reduction. Senate Republicans wanted a smaller cut, and there was dispute over how much should go toward retirement of the national debt.

In the midst of that row, the legislative budget mired down. It now rests in a joint committee of Senators and Representatives. Meanwhile, taxes are going in one direction and appropriation in another.

#### FROM COMMITTEES TO SUBCOMMITTEES

Streamlining trimmed off about three-fifths of the old committees. Each committee was expected to do whatever investigating was needed in its own field.

But the streamlining left 47 Senators and Representatives who otherwise would have been committee chairmen without any committees to head. The first breaks in the reorganization plan came with the creation of special investigation committees; for national defense and small business in the Senate; for supply of newsprint and small business in the House.

After the committees were organized, the dam broke. The new committees were large, and dealt with many subjects. And there were about 40 chairless would-be chairmen. The committees broke into huddles of subcommittees. In the House, some committees have 10 or 12 subcommittees. Members who used to go from one committee meeting to another now go from one subcommittee meeting to another.

This new technique in some cases is tending to add another layer of red tape to congressional procedure. Under the old system, the committee that prepared a bill brought the measure to the floor, directly. Now the first group to handle a bill usually is a subcommittee, and the product has to be approved by the full committee before going to the floor.

If the chairman insists upon a meticulous study by the full committee before approval, the work of the subcommittee is gone over from end to end, amounting to a double job.

In like vein the Washington Times-Herald commented:

Congress is bidding fair to reorganize itself into a state of utter confusion. If it continues to streamline and simplify at its present pace, it will become so complicated and unwieldy that another city will have to be built just to house the overflow subcommittees.

The major idea behind reorganization was to cut down the committees to a practical minimum; to avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. This was very laudible, because there was almost as much duplication hereabouts as duplicity.

The actual result, however, seems to be that Congress has merely gone from confusion to chaos. Although the regular standing committees have been reduced materially, five subcommittees now bloom where only one was a blooming nuisance before.

Take the House Army and Navy Affairs Committees as a notable example. Theoretically, they have been merged into one committee on the Armed Services. But whereas there were these two committees before, now this merged committee has 12 subcommittees.

The Army and Navy Committees had a room each under the old order. The merged committee now takes up two committee rooms and nine suites—practically one entire corridor of the old House Office Building.

The number of standard committees in the House was cut from 49 to 19, but there is less room now than ever before. In fact, nearly a month after the reconvening of Congress, upwards of 20 members still are without offices and are forced to transact their business at make-shift desks stuck in the corners of caucus rooms or storerooms.

These officeless statesmen have literally been reorganized out of a joint they can call their own. It seems every possible bit of space around the Capitol and environs is occupied by a subcommittee on something or other.

Unless something is done, very few members will ever have any clear idea of proposed legislation. It used to be that a bill was threshed out in its entirety before the full standing committee. The committee then was able to present it in fairly clear form to the entire body. Every member of the committee, if he had listened carefully and intelligently, had a good idea of the picture as a whole.

Let us again take the merged military committee as an example. Its twelve subcommittees are composed of 10 members each, who consider various phases of the proposed bill. The net result is that the full committee never gets to hear the full legislation.

But of all the unworkable and impracticable provisions of the Reorganization Act, the section providing for a legislative budget is the most unworkable and impracticable.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the legislative budget has had a fair trial. I want to extend my compliments to the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations last Congress, and Senator BRIDGES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, on their efforts to make it work. They gave it a fair trial and they made every effort to get results.

So far as I am personally concerned, let me say that I have not changed my position as was intimated here. In the last Congress I introduced this same resolution, and it was pigeonholed.

I introduced also in this session a resolution providing for the suspension of this section pending further study and I am glad to note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] agree with me that the section should be taken out of the law.

Why did we not press that resolution instead of the pending resolution? Because the leadership on that side of the House has repeatedly issued releases to the press in the last 2 or 3 weeks in which they said emphatically they would fight to the death any effort to abolish the provision. Rather than engage in a partisan contest, on a matter on which there should be no partisanship, we then proposed this resolution with the thought that it would meet with general approval.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I regret that I do not have the time, but I shall be glad to entertain an interruption by my beloved friend from Pennsylvania at some other time.

Mr. Speaker, of all of the unworkable and impracticable provisions in the Reorganization Act none is so unworkable and impracticable as the legislative budget. We have tried it. We gave it every opportunity. It cannot be made effective. We can no more expect success, Mr. Speaker, with this well-meant but hopeless proposal than we can expect a verdict from the jury before it has heard the evidence.

How can we judge the correctness of this mass of estimates? The Government has been working on its preparation for more than a year. It is a book the size of an unabridged dictionary. It is possible there are proposed expenditures in there which ought to come out. It may be there are others which should be included. But, how can we tell without studying them? How can we reach a dependable over-all figure? It is absolutely impossible. It cannot be done, gentlemen, try as we may.

If under the proposed system you fix the date early enough to affect expenditures there is no time in which to hold hearings and arrive at a dependable conclusion. If on the other hand you delay the date until after hearings have been held the bills will already have been passed and it is too late to affect them.

Let us take up the bill itself with this problem before us.

Section 138 created a Joint Committee of Congress on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees—Ways and Means of the House and Finance of the Senate—and the two appropriating committees of Congress—Appropriations of the House and Appropriations of the Senate. The combined membership of these four committees is 104.

The law requires this joint committee to report to the respective Houses of Congress not later than February 15 of each year a legislative budget for the next year including the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures. They are also required to report a recommendation as to the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in the next year with a reserve for emergencies if deemed necessary. If there is an estimated surplus, the joint committee has to make a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Nothing is said about a decrease in taxes. The law leaves



no choice to the joint committee as to the disposition of the surplus; it ties their hands in favor of debt reduction.

The controversial nature of the action under section 138 comes from the requirement that the joint committee accompany their report with a concurrent resolution proposing adoption of the legislative budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated by Congress at that session for expenditure in the next fiscal year. Nothing is said about a limit on appropriations for the subsequent fiscal years which might conceivably be an important factor in the financing program of those years. If there is an estimated deficit instead of a projected surplus, the concurrent resolution is to contain a declaration that it is the sense of Congress that the public debt should be increased by the amount of the deficit. Again it ties the hands of the joint committee as to the manner of meeting the deficit. A recommendation for new taxation or partial new taxation and partial increase in debt would not suffice.

There is no clarity as to what Congress intended in section 138 by the legislative budget. Did it envision the complete make-up of the present appropriation bills in final detail? Did it hope for one consolidated appropriation bill? Did it contemplate only a schedule of the items in general? Or did it intend simply an allocation of available revenue in general lump to each of the departments and other agencies? The only definite expression in the section is that it shall be a legislative budget and include the estimated receipts and expenditures and recommend a maximum limit on the total to be appropriated for expenditure in the ensuing year.

The outside date fixed for reporting the legislative budget is February 15 of each year. This automatically precludes a detailed budget because it could not be made ready by that time. If it envisioned only schedules of items or allocations by agencies those could only soundly be reached by consideration of the details which comprise the whole and again the dead line of time defeats practical compliance. A consolidated appropriation bill is ruled out for the same reason. The upset date contributes to make section 138 action the vehicle of the cleaver instead of the scalpel.

As will be noted, the over-all budget figure, even when finally adopted, is not mandatory. It is not binding in any respect. It establishes no statutory limitation on the Federal budget or on the amount appropriated by Congress or on expenditures. It is merely the expression of a pious hope, which Congress may disregard, and which Congress has invariably disregarded.

The plan is wholly impracticable. A figure was finally adopted in the last session. But has any Member of the House ever heard it referred to in connection with any appropriation bill? After the legislative budget was adopted in the Eightieth Congress we passed all the supply bills carrying innumerable items and billions of dollars. Was the over-all figure ever considered or referred to at any time during the consideration of these

bills? After its adoption by the House and Senate it was never heard from again. If adopted in this Congress it will not be taken into consideration in the preparation and passage of a single appropriation bill. It is wasted time and effort. Try as we may, give it our whole-hearted support, and it is still a dead letter. It cannot be made effective.

We take the time of a committee of 104 busy men, at a particularly busy time in the session and we expend, in printing and other expenses incident to the passage of a legislative budget, over \$31,000, as we did in the last Congress. And at the end of the session there is no advantage of any kind to compensate for the expenditure of time or money.

Permit me to quote from men whose opinion should have some weight in such matters: Here are comments taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### OPINIONS

Mr. BROWN. The provision is of no great value. We cannot fix this early in any congressional session with any accuracy just what the spending requirements will be. If we wait until later there will be no necessity of fixing the ceiling because it will already have been fixed by the votes on appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. Impossible to take the figures herewith submitted and arrive at any conclusion which will jibe with appropriations that so far have been made and which will be made in the rest of the session. That part of the Reorganization Act was a mistake. It is not binding on the Congress and is not a satisfactory guide to what might result. The whole thing is a stab in the dark.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This requirement has proved itself to be impracticable.

Senator BRIDGES. The Legislative Reorganization Act became a law August 2, 1946. It directed the four House and Senate Revenue and Appropriation Committees to recommend to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. Such report to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in that year.

As the act is now written I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score. It asks the Joint Budget Committee to give its estimates of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted.

Actually, long and detailed hearings are necessary if we are to have a realistic picture of the proper relationship between revenues, appropriations, expenditures, and debt reduction.

Senator TAFT could claim no more for it than an intelligent guess, while Representative RAYBURN, of Texas, House Democratic leader, said all that was done was to "pick a figure out of the air."

These comments do not come from men lacking responsibility. From the joint committee's report, many are from men in positions of high responsibility and leadership. They do not want deliberately to confuse, yet they are required by law to perform a duty which leads nowhere.

The press of the country is in a large measure in agreement with this view. The Washington Star, one of the great papers of the Nation, which has consistently supported efforts to achieve a

workable legislative budget, said editorially:

#### BUDGET CUTTING BY GUESSWORK

The manifest irresolution with which the Senate resolved to cut President Truman's budget by two and a half billion dollars is understandable. The Senate was making a necessary gesture, in accordance with provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee makes it plain that the gesture should not be taken too seriously.

The committee, for its part, tossed its budget reduction recommendation into the Senate's lap with a warning that it was little more than a figure grabbed out of a hat. Chairman BRIDGES of the joint committee put it this way in his report: "As the act is now written, I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score." The law, he pointed out, requires the committee to give its estimate "of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted."

When the legislative budget plan was first tried out last year, the committee made a sincere effort to get the facts, holding hearings at which the Budget Director was a witness. But Senate and House were unable to agree whether the President's budget should be slashed six billions or four and a half billions, and the plan ultimately failed. This year the committee did not even bother to hold hearings. Not even the Budget Director was questioned. The committee just made a guess and handed it to Congress on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

It would not be fair, however, to criticize the committee for this casual attitude toward a matter of such moment to the country. As Chairman BRIDGES stressed in his report and as others at the Capitol have said before him, it is just expecting too much to require a newly constituted group of more than a hundred legislators to submit an intelligent report before the February 15 dead line fixed by law. This cumbersome group of changing membership has found it impossible to study, analyze, and report on a fifteen-hundred-page budget in the few weeks allowed.

The Star also carried an article analyzing admirably the entire situation:

Although the La Follette-Monroney Act reorganizing the Congress is properly regarded as a forward-looking piece of legislation, it is becoming increasingly clear that at least one of its provisions is of dubious value. This is the section directing Congress to establish a legislative budget.

Under this portion of the act the committees which handle revenue bills and the committees which handle appropriation bills in each House are required to meet at the beginning of each session of Congress. After consultation and consideration of the budget recommendations of the President these committees are directed to report to their respective Houses an estimate of receipts and expenditures. The difficulty with this section is that it requires this report to be filed on February 15 and to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated. The recommendation is to be accompanied by a resolution adopting the budget and fixing a ceiling on the forthcoming appropriations.

Until the passage of the La Follette-Monroney Act the preparation of the Federal budget was considered a purely executive function. The itemized list of proposed appropriations for each department and agency of Government is transmitted by the President to Congress on the day after his message on the state of the Union. This, of course, does not mean that the executive budget is binding upon Congress since in

passing appropriation bills either House can revise or reject any item contained in it. It did mean, however, that with respect to any reductions made by Congress the agency affected had been afforded an opportunity for a hearing before both the House and Senate Appropriation Committees and a consideration of its case on the merits. The only aspect of finality to the President's recommendations is that no agency may ask its subcommittee on appropriations for an amount in excess of his budget estimate.

As a result of the limited period available to Congress to frame a budget, the joint committees are now compelled to act without an opportunity for scientific appraisal of the merits of the particular items. Consequently the budgetary proceedings in the House and Senate and in the Republican caucuses have been distinguished more for partisan prejudice than for sober legislative thought. While informed persons would agree that with the cessation of hostilities it became incumbent upon the President and Congress to adhere to a budget which would bring about a significant reduction in the national debt, apparently the majority leaders in Congress have given little or no thought to the question of whether the best way of attaining this was to cut expenditures or to increase the tax rates. Instead the Republicans accepted as party gospel the theory that Federal expenditures were much too high and that the President's budget could be reduced anywhere from \$6,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000.

Inasmuch as the Republican leadership in both branches took the position that the joint legislative budget committees were justified in making such a recommendation without disclosing specific items in the present budget which are to be reduced or omitted, it is apparent that both the six billion and the four billion figures were picked out of the air. The only approximation which either of these figures bears to the arithmetic of the problem is that if Representative Knudsen, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is permitted to carry out his pledge of a 20-percent reduction in income taxes, the estimated loss to the Treasury would be close to \$4,000,000,000.

Of course, it is understandable that after long years of frustration, apostles of economy in government are naturally resentful of a budget of \$37,000,000,000. But to strike out blindly without considering the merits of the functions which the Federal Government would necessarily have to abandon under the proposed legislative ceiling is to pursue a course which would defeat the underlying policies of the La Follette-Monroney Act. By and large the purpose of this legislation was to enable Congress to act upon information and mature consideration, rather than upon passion and prejudice. To realize this objective, the act not only limited the unwieldy size and number of committees but also made provisions for staffing them with expert advisers. But before placing this scientific committee machinery to work on the highly technical problem of putting our fiscal house in order, Congress is now acting in a vacuum on a question having tremendous repercussions upon our fate abroad as well as upon our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, the section should be suspended and opportunity afforded to substitute a method through which an accurate and dependable budget can be determined and determined in time to affect the appropriations and expenditures of the annual budget. As that is impossible at this time, the only alternative is to adopt the pending resolution and provide time in which to make the best computation possible under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I revert to remarks on this subject when the adoption of the Reorganization Act was under debate:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is the heart and soul of the American system of government. Destroy or nullify its functions and you have left but the shell of free government. Any influence which tends to reduce the confidence or the regard in which it is held by the American people militates to that extent against the effectiveness of the Government, if not the preservation of the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." When it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried, "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, so recently, Hitler, endeavoring to seize the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's House of Representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men has sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the Representatives of the American people on this floor. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today. Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the Congress in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

The Congress has been subject to criticism—as it should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American is the right to criticize Congress and the Members of Congress, and

that right has been widely and fully exercised from the First Congress down to the Seventy-ninth Congress now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that Congress and Congressmen be unjustly accused on many occasions than that they should escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation.

Newspaper columnists and radio broadcasters have vied with written and spoken jeremiads delivered here on this floor to an extent that at times transcend even the bounds of truth and good taste. The abuse of Congress, criticism of the Congress and its membership and its procedure, has been without precedent since the stormy days of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses when the House Rules were a national political issue.

Effort has been made to convince the American people that something is so wrong with congressional procedure that dire disaster menaces the country, its form of government, and its democratic institutions, unless immediate and drastic action is taken to save the Nation and its democratic practices from onrushing ruin and destruction. In order to foster this propaganda a campaign of abuse and disparagement of Congress individually and collectively has been waged. Let me quote from just a few of many such castigations. Here is a summarization of such criticism epitomized by one of the distinguished Members of the other body and published in the Pageant magazine:

The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests have been getting reelected and lining their pockets. Short of everything else they are lazy and overpaid. They have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and in a way that is fortunate for Congressmen are numskulls, they are windbags, obstructionists, and worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from raiding the Treasury.

Here is a quotation from a statement made on our own floor:

The people think we are a bunch of clowns.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe the gentleman who made that statement has heard from his home folks and he does not know about the rest of us.

Mr. CANNON. That is quite possible. These statements reflect not only on Congress and Congressmen but on the American people. Here is a statement from a national magazine, *Life*:

Like the American people, they—

That is the Congressmen—

Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are good people, honest people, patriotic people, who lack sufficient experience to be able to weigh those statements. Especially is that true when they see those statements in books or pamphlets.



I have received many letters stating, "If the charge is not true, why do you not sue him?" But the gentleman knows how futile and how expensive that sort of procedure is. When a charge is made against the House as a whole, it does occur to me that the makers of the charge should be brought before the bar of the House.

Mr. CANNON. I would hardly favor bringing in the publisher of any magazine or newspaper. As I have said, it is better that Congress be accused untruthfully a hundred times than not to be accused one time when we should be accused.

I think we should demonstrate, as we have demonstrated, and as we are demonstrating, on the floor here, the untruthfulness of these statements.

Mr. Speaker, here is another statement appearing in Reader's Scope:

Washington's great Capitol dome covers a lot of statemanship and a lot of skulduggery and bungling inefficiency.

Again, here is an editorial appearing in one of the great newspapers of the Nation:

Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, is bogged down in red tape.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is no distinction here between the Congress and its membership. They do not make that statement with reference to some one or two Members of the House. They make the broad statement that the Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, and is bogged down in red tape. It is in the deadliest form in which it could be put in order to affect the sentiment of the country. There is no differentiation between the institution and its membership.

Then I include a statement from the Saturday Evening Post, in one of the most astounding articles I have ever read in a national magazine, a number of copies of which have been sent to me from different parts of the United States:

Congress has been ridiculed by the public and kicked around by the executive departments until a groveling inferiority complex has brought wide conviction to its Members that the future is without hope.

An astonishing statement in a great national magazine, that all hope is gone. These statements have appeared in newspapers and periodicals in every city in the United States, not merely once, but systematically and serially. They are not merely attacks upon the House and its membership, but the idea intended to be conveyed to the people is that a serious situation obtains today which, if not remedied in the immediate future, is fraught with catastrophic disaster.

The impression is given that the situation amounts to a national crisis in which the liberties and the integrity of the Government itself are at stake. As an example, in this article in the Saturday Evening Post the situation is represented as "an issue as grave as any in the history of federalization."

Now that is covering a wide territory but that is the phraseology of the statement. The article goes on to say this supreme and transcendent issue is "whether Congress can modernize its

archaic machinery and thoroughly regain its historic position of power without which the democratic process will fall."

It will be noticed that the unmistakable inference is that Congress has lost its powers, and that unless some miracle of recovery can be achieved, democracy is dead, and this in face of the fact that Congress in this session has brushed aside any conflict with other branches of the Government, has maintained its position and power under the Constitution as never before, and has just administered victoriously, without error or scandal, the greatest war in history—a record unapproached in that respect by any Congress since the establishment of the Republic.

Another Member of the coordinate body of the Congress make this statement: "Upon a stronger and more effective Congress may well depend the preservation of democracy in the United States."

You cannot imagine a statement of a more serious tenor.

And another Member of the same body says that something should be done "to see that the American Congress does not wither away."

Another Member of this body says: "Unless the representative system is strengthened, Congress will fade out as an effective control by the people of their Government."

And, again, this: "Situation means a concentration of Government power in one branch of Government. It is a threat to the basic liberties of the people."

And, by another Member of the other body: "We must have a reorganization of Congress to the end that the Congress of the United States may reclaim its lost powers and prestige, and may once again become a truly coordinated branch of the Government."

These Jeremiahs insist that it is not merely a problem; that it is a danger. For example, here is a quotation from the floor:

Rule by the people must surely end if the Federal Legislature is abolished or reduced to relative unimportance. Both friends and foes of Congress agree that has in a measure already come.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder how they ever got the idea that the friends of Congress agreed to any such proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I think anybody who is familiar with the actual situation here will appreciate the absurdity of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri who is now addressing the House knows more about parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure than any other man alive today. I say that advisedly. I knew him when he was a Parliamentarian. I knew him when he first came to Congress. I believe I am as familiar with CANNON's precedents as any other man in the House. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will agree that the rules of the House of Representatives as they now stand constitute the greatest system of parliamentary procedure the world has ever known. Am I right in that?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is unfortunate in his premise but he affirms

the opinion of every constitutional authority in his estimate of the rules of the House.

Our system of procedure is the product of more than a thousand years of legislative experience. Some objection has been made that it is not up to date, that like a woman's hat or a man's necktie, it ought to change every year. As a matter of fact, parliamentary procedure is based upon fundamental rules of decorum which do not change any more than the fundamental rules of human conduct as set forth in the Ten Commandments change. It has been built up through centuries of experience in various legislative bodies, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, continuing down through the development of parliamentary government in the colonial legislatures in this country and under our own system of government for more than 150 years.

The tenor of these statements is that the Government faces a crisis. That the threat is serious, the danger is real, the life of representative government is at stake. I ask you seriously, if there is any basis for these statements so industriously disseminated over the country.

Continuing, here is an editorial from one of the great newspapers of the Nation, a newspaper which probably ranks as 1 of the 10 great papers on the American Continent. This is what it says, referring to the situation supposed to have brought about the appointment of the streamlining committee:

The crisis is a challenge to do something before it is too late. It is an alarming situation.

"Do something before it is too late." Too late for what? "An alarming situation." What is it that is so alarming?

This Congress has been tried as no other Congress has been tried. It has had to meet situations no other Congress has been called upon to meet and it has met them effectively and successfully. Still they say that the situation is so alarming that before it is too late something must be done or chaos will follow.

Every once in a while a messiah arises to predict the end of the world, but the world keeps on going, and despite these tongues of Thersites, Congress keeps on doing a good job—the best it has ever done—but these prophets of calamity say that something must be done, must be done quickly, must be done before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will use another 30 minutes.

Continuing, this statement says:

Congress has largely abdicated its legislative as well as its supervisory functions and duties.

Gentlemen, anyone visiting the House on any day it is in session would be surprised at that statement. What has Congress abdicated? What right or prerogative has it relinquished? What function has it waived? Wherein has it failed in any duty or responsibility?

I have read some of the testimony adduced before the streamlining committee. The committee invited all Members

of the House and Senate and anyone else who had a grievance and felt that something was wrong and ought to be remedied, to appear before them. Much of the testimony adduced before the committee borders on the ridiculous. One of the first Members of the other body who appeared before that committee began his statement with an exhortation of the acoustic properties of the Senate Chamber. It has been claimed here that the liberties of the Republic were at stake, and when he was called in and asked how and why they were at stake, he said he could not be heard when he spoke in the Senate Chamber and something ought to be done about it. Another mentioned in his opening statement that he had received a request from a constituent as to where colored feathers could be sold. He was irked because a constituent who wanted to dispose of commodities which he was in a position to produce inquired of him where a market could be found. He was advised to stand on his dignity and refuse to answer.

Mr. Speaker, we invite every legitimate criticism. But many of the statements that have been so widely circulated in order to whip up interest over this question, are without any foundation of fact.

For example, the statement has been made on the floor here and copied in most of the metropolitan papers of the country, and one of the great newspapers of the country carried it in a box on its editorial page, day after day, week after week, and month after month, as follows:

Not since 1893 has the machinery of Congress been overhauled.

Largely on that one statement they based their demand for a change of congressional procedure.

Now, that situation, even if it were true, might not be so serious, because the fundamental rules of procedure in a deliberative body do not change from year to year. There are no fashions in legislative procedure. We do not have to have a new set of rules every spring. But the thing I am calling attention to is that the statement which has been so widely publicized, and upon which most of the objection to our procedure has been founded, is utterly without a basis of fact. It simply is not true.

For example, instead of going back to 1893 for a revision of our procedure, the greatest revision of the rules of the House of Representatives of all time was in the Sixty-second Congress, 1911-12. There are Members still on the floor who participated in that revision. We had just come through a political campaign in which the issue was the rules of the House, and, in particular, the control of the Speaker over the House, and the country had, by its vote at the polls, demanded a change in the rules and curtailment of the power of the Speaker. When the House assembled that was the prior item of business.

Accordingly the revision of 1911-12 was the most drastic in the history of the Congress. Committees were established and discontinued. That is the piece of resistance before us today—as to whether we will have new committees or retain old committees or consolidate com-

mittees, or what we are going to do about it. In the revision of 1911-12 many committees were changed. Committees were created and abolished. The control of the Speaker over the House, which had become autocratic, was broken. The Speaker's power of recognition, which had been one of his great prerogatives, was circumscribed by the establishment of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, the Discharge Calendar rule, provision for Calendar Wednesday, and restriction to the minority of the right to offer a motion to recommit.

The House took away from the Speaker those powers which had given him autocratic control over legislation. Reference of bills to committees was standardized by the rigid enforcement of the rule of jurisdiction. Recalcitrant committees and managers of conferences were rendered subject to summary discharge. The Holman rule was permanently incorporated in the rules of the House—a provision which has saved more money than any other one provision in the rules. The right to appoint committees, perhaps the greatest source of his power, was taken from the Speaker. Previously he could put a man on a committee or could take him off. If a man did not do what he was told to do, he was taken off the committee, or was sometimes put on a committee with the understanding that he would take some particular action. That power—a power which had been in effect since the beginning of the Government—was taken from him. The Speaker was made ineligible to membership on the Committee on Rules. I remember when the Committee on Rules consisted of three members: John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois; and the gentleman from Mississippi, one of the most distinguished Members of this House of all time, John Sharp Williams. The committee would bring in a rule providing for the consideration of such legislation as they wanted. John Sharp Williams would rise and protest vigorously against the "outrage." Finally, when they wanted a meeting of this committee, John Dalzell would go over to Mr. Williams on the floor and say, "Come on, John, we are going to perpetrate another 'outrage.'" No bill could be brought up unless the Speaker approved it.

All this was changed in 1911-12. For the first time in the history of the House, its rules were completely democratized. It constituted the most important and farthest-reaching revision in the annals of parliamentary government in the United States; numerous other changes have been made in subsequent revisions; and yet the country is told that nothing has been done in the way of revising the rules since 1893. In other words, this statement, which has been used more than anything else to bolster up the claim that our procedure is antiquated, out of date, and inadequate, is based upon a statement that is utterly without foundation.

Among the statements lacking in accuracy but advanced as a reason for revision of House procedure is the statement that bills are referred to committees in consideration of the attitude of

the chairman toward the proposed legislation. As you know, the Parliamentarian actually refers the bills by authority granted to the Speaker under the rules of the House. The inference is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the man who so enjoys the confidence and affection of this body as to be elected its Presiding Officer, will, if he is opposed to a measure, refer it to the committee where the chairman is hostile to that measure, or if he favors it, will refer it to a committee where the chairman is favorable to the legislation. I have here the book and page on which this charge is set forth.

As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the facts. Never has the oldest Member of this House ever heard, much less known, it to be so much as intimated that the Speaker was governed by his attitude on a bill in its reference to a committee.

Then I think there is no charge that has been made more frequently, and more inaccurately, in an endeavor to secure public approval of some notion that something is seriously wrong with the procedure of the House than the statement that committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the jurisdiction of the committees of the House is so definitely established and has been for so many years that the question of the reference of a bill never arises on the floor. There is no overlapping committee jurisdiction in this House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the rules of the House provide that, if any Member has an objection to the reference of a bill, he can make a point of order and bring the matter to the attention of the House and the Speaker and have a ruling by the House itself?

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, because I was just proceeding to make the statement the gentleman has made. If a bill should be referred to a committee which does not have jurisdiction, there is every provision for its reference to the committee properly having jurisdiction. If it is a private bill, as the gentleman very well says, a point of order can be raised by any Member. I ask you, when did you ever hear a point of order raised on the floor against the reference of a bill to a committee? I do not recall that in recent years anybody has ever made a point of order against the reference of a bill. Still they would have the country believe that we have such confusion here and so many committees have jurisdiction of the same subject matter that it interferes with the transaction of the business on the floor of the Congress.

The committees of the House are jealous of their jurisdiction, and if anybody, at any time, by the improper reference of a bill should infringe upon their jurisdiction, that committee would immediately protest. The rules provide that if a public bill is improperly referred there are three methods of reference to proper jurisdiction.

First, By unanimous consent. A Member may rise on the floor and say, "This bill has been referred to the wrong committee. My committee has jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that the bill



be rereferred." The fact that you have heard no such request in many years is convincing proof that jurisdiction of the committees is well established and understood and there are no conflicting jurisdictions which would give rise to any dispute between committees as to the reference of any of the thousands of bills which are referred every session.

Second. Rereference may be made on the authorized motion of the committee claiming jurisdiction. If any committee thinks a bill to which it is entitled has been improperly referred, they may come in here and ask for a rereference. Have you heard in recent years of a rereference on the motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction of a bill assigned to another committee?

Third. A rereference may be made on the motion of a committee to which a bill has been erroneously referred. Motions for change of reference are privileged, and yet there has been no contest over jurisdiction of committees on motions or change of reference since I can remember. There can be no more convincing proof of the lack of interference between the jurisdictions or the lack of overlapping jurisdictions between the committees of the House. In other words, the widely publicized charge that there is overlapping jurisdiction is without foundation.

Every facility is given for a change of reference if there has been an improper reference, even on appeal. And the fact that none of these facilities have been invoked in recent years is conclusive evidence that there is no foundation for the charge of overlapping jurisdictions so often reiterated through the columns of the press.

It is seldom that a bill is introduced in the House which does not contain matter falling within the jurisdiction of one committee, other matter within the jurisdiction of a second committee and still other matter under the jurisdiction of a third or fourth or fifth committee. In the same bill may be several provisions each of which comes within the province of as many different committees. However, the rule which always applies, and the rule which is always followed by the Parliamentarian, and the rule which has always been satisfactory to the House, is that the bill goes to the committee which has jurisdiction of the major matter in the bill. No change in rules of jurisdiction that you can suggest will prevent that. That is not a conflict of jurisdiction. It is the way in which the bill was drawn, and no change that you can make in the rules would affect it in the slightest.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No matter how many committees you set up or how you outline the jurisdiction of the particular committees you set up, the same thing would occur in the future at all times?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. It could not be avoided by any provision of the rules.

So far as departmental officials coming before several committees on the

same subject is concerned, the repetition of evidence before different committees is highly salutary. The members of the committee have an opportunity to review the data submitted by the witness on former appearances and are in better position for cross-examination; the witness goes back to the department with a larger cross section of congressional opinion; and the executive and legislative branches of the Government have been each time a little more closely associated. The more frequently the departments are subjected to congressional inquiry the better—and the more carefully they will watch their step in administration and the greater care they will exercise in the expenditure of public funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are other instances of misstatements made in order to inflame the people against Congress and congressional procedure. One such instance, for example, is the statement that 95 percent of the bills passed by Congress are drafted in the departments. We had the testimony of the legislative drafting authorities of the Senate and House on that matter. In the House they testified that 23 percent of the bills introduced, and practically all the major legislation which passed the House, passed through their office. On the Senate side, they testified that 50 percent of the bills enacted passed through their office. Any member of the Committee on Appropriations can testify that no department has ever written any appropriation bill that ever came to the floor. In other words, the country is led to believe that a situation exists here which is completely different from what actually exists and that this situation makes it imperative that the procedures of the House be radically revised.

Here is still another misrepresentation: A Member of the House last week reprinted an editorial in the *Record* from a newspaper in his district which said that because he was a new Member he was not allowed to speak and had no opportunity to express himself on the floor. We all know that the newest Member of the House stands on equal footing with the oldest Member of the House, in that respect.

The Committee on Appropriations, like the rest of the committees of the House, frequently has bills on the floor, and any Member who applies can get all the time he wants. No distinction in recognition for debate is made between Members on the ground of length of service. If this gentleman had applied, he could have talked as frequently and as long as the oldest Members of the House, either in point of age or service, or previous condition of servitude.

Another charge which will not bear the test of accuracy is that the men who serve as chairmen of committees have

ex officio the power to report legislation or to kill legislation. On the face of it the charge cannot be sustained. Nothing could be further from the truth. The committee of which I happen to be a member has 45 members and the chairman has 1 vote in the 45 and no more. He cannot report a bill unless a majority of the other 44 members approve and he must report a bill if a majority of the committee directs him to report it no matter how unalterably opposed he may be to the measure. The myth that the chairman of a committee has any more power than any other member of the committee is another fabrication calculated to disturb the people and shake their confidence in the one institution which is the safeguard of their liberties and the guaranty of their right of free government.

In the brief time remaining let me say just a word about the much-mooted question of seniority. It is a matter that is not included in the report but it has been so widely discussed I would like to scatter just a few grains of truth and reason on the subject.

To begin with, the importance of the chairmanships is greatly exaggerated. There may be a little glamour connected with the chairmanships but that is about all. Some chairmen have extra rooms and patronage, but as chairman of one of the House committees I do not have even these modest perquisites. I have no more personal clerks and no more office space than I had before I became chairman, and I pay for all my own stationery.

Furthermore, the rule of seniority does not always obtain in the election of a chairman. The rule of seniority is in that respect neither absolute nor invariable. In my own committee there have been notable instances in which the rule of seniority was disregarded. For example, in the Fifty-eighth Congress, although Henry H. Bingham, of Pennsylvania, was ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, was elected chairman. Again, in the Sixty-seventh Congress, although Charles R. Davis, of Minnesota, was the member of longest service on the committee, Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, was made chairman.

The House, under its system of procedure, may elevate a member from the foot, or from any intervening position, to the chairmanship of a committee—and has done so, the seniority tradition to the contrary notwithstanding.

But, regardless of the effect of its application, why should the rule of seniority be deprecated in the Congress of the United States, when it is followed implicitly in every other major activity and industry in the United States?

In the armed forces, in the Army and the Navy, the rule of seniority obtains and has been followed from the days of Gen. George Washington and Commodore Barry. Here is a quotation from a recent editorial in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*:

Regular Army promotions up to brigadier general are traditionally automatic, predicated on seniority.

It is the rule in the War Department and in the Navy Department, and has been so in all armies and navies for time immemorial.

It is likewise the rule in the labor unions of the Nation. Quoting from the International Teamster:

Members of labor unions rank according to seniority. War veterans are assured they will be given their seniority rights when they return from the service.

The rule of labor seniority has been affirmed in two recent decisions in the Federal courts—one by Judge Lederle, in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, and the other by Judge Briggie, of Springfield, Ill.

Commenting on the decision of Judge Lederle, the CIO News said:

"A veteran is rehired in accordance with his seniority, and continues to work in accordance with his seniority," the CIO veterans' committee pointed out in interpreting Judge Lederle's ruling. "Seniority under union contract is the controlling factor, and if operations are curtailed the veteran may be laid off in line of seniority just as any other worker."

With reference to the Briggie opinion, Labor, the official organ of the railroad brotherhoods, said:

A returning serviceman should regain his old job rights and seniority plus accumulated seniority for time spent in uniform. Thus, a veteran should have the same seniority standing as though he had never left his job.

The rule of seniority is followed in international relations and the dean of the diplomatic corps is always the ambassador of longest service, irrespective of the size or standing of his country.

In keeping with that long-established precedent, the United Nations organization follows the rule of seniority. In order to be elected to the International Court of the UN, a candidate must secure a majority vote in the 57-nation Assembly and also in the 11-nation Security Council.

Here is the rule:

If more than one citizen from the same country gets a majority, only the eldest can become a member of the Court.

The new Russian Constitution, direct and dynamic in its approach to the administrative problems of the day, recognizes the rule of seniority and under its provisions the first sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. are always opened by the oldest deputies of each chamber.

Just today President Truman himself emphatically voiced the importance of long service in Congress.

I quote from an Associated Press dispatch just released:

President Truman said today he believes it is a good general policy for Senators of long service to remain in the Senate rather than take other jobs.

He made this observation at his news conference in response to a question bearing on his recent action in urging Senator McFarland, of Arizona, to remain in the Senate rather than take a Federal judgeship in his State. The questioner wanted to know if the President thinks this is a good general policy.

The President replied affirmatively, asserting that a Senator with lengthy service is invaluable to his State and should remain in the Senate.

In matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as well as civil and temporal, the rule of seniority is observed, notably in the Holy Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. In both, recognition and advancement are by seniority.

St. Peter himself admonishes:

Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility, for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.

In every department of the economic life of the world—national and international—the rule of seniority obtains, and has obtained for time immemorial. Why should Congress be made the exception to the rule?

Directly associated with the diatribes against seniority is the charge that age and experience accumulated in the service of the House disqualify for further usefulness as a Member of the Congress.

Since when has age become a disqualifying factor in human endeavor and accomplishment? Between the ages of 70 and 83, Commodore Vanderbilt added \$10,000,000 to his fortune. Verdi at 85 produced his magnificent Ave Maria, his Stabat Mater, and his Te Deum. What a loss to the world if he had been retired at 80. Oliver Wendell Holmes at 79 wrote his *Over the Teacups*, and Tennyson at 83 wrote *Crossing the Bar*. Samuel Gompers was head of organized labor in his seventy-fifth year and John Cardinal Glennon, of St. Louis, was elevated to the cardinalate in his eighty-fourth year. President Roosevelt's war Cabinet was made up of Hull at 72, Jones at 70, Ickes at 70, Knox at 70, and Stimson at 76—the Cabinet that won the greatest war in history—and Henry Ford at 82 came back from retirement to make an incalculable contribution to industry and American victory.

Carried to their ultimate conclusions, these critics of seniority propose, in effect, to demote General MacArthur and put a second lieutenant in command, to retire William Green and substitute a husky young hodcarrier, to superannuate His Holiness Pope Pius XII and elevate a parish priest, to fire Eugene Meyer and install a young police-court reporter, to supersede Speaker RAYBURN and put a young two-term in the chair. They badger men grown old in honored service in the House, men who have made supreme contributions to the Nation in the most critical period in human history with the taunt: "Yeah, yer gittin' old." It is the philosophy of the aborigine; the culture and finesse and good taste of the jungle.

It is a philosophy repudiated by a thousand years of experience in the parliaments of the world. The situation is well summarized in a speech delivered by President Taft before the Ohio Society of Washington:

We are told by Edmund Burke himself that it was by slow degrees and constant discussion that Charles James Fox became the greatest parliamentary debater the world ever saw. Fox entered the British Commons before he was 20 years old. He remained a member of that body until his death.

Had Fox been an American and a Member of our Congress, he would have been fortu-

nate if he had been chosen to and served in 10 Congresses—20 years. Sam Randall was not bred a statesman, but he became one of our great parliamentary leaders by reason of his long service. Had John G. Carlisle been English born, he would have served in the House of Commons, at the least, 50 years. Gladstone was in the Commons 50 years. Had he been an American, it is doubtful if the whim of a single constituency would have allowed him 12 Congresses.

There is a truth as profound as political experience can make it.

It is further expressed by a speech delivered by Speaker Clark on the floor of the House during his speakership:

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

The best rule is for a district to select a man young enough to learn and to grow, with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House.

But the young man must be willing to learn, and grow, and should be content to rise gradually. We can all appreciate his impatience. We have all been through it ourselves, to a greater or lesser degree. After a spirited campaign we were finally elected to Congress—the culmination of a life's ambition. The newspapers of our district and State had daily featured our speeches and activities. An enthusiastic delegation with a brass band saw us off on our train to Washington and our friends freely predicted that we would wake Congress up. In fact we rather encouraged that idea.

I recall a Congressman who came to Washington a few years ago assuring his constituents that when he got here he would start Congress off at 9 o'clock in the morning instead of waiting to meet at noon and wasting half the day. Some years ago I happened to be walking behind a new Congressman and his wife on their way over from the House Office Building to attend his first session and his charming little wife said nervously, "Oh, I do hope they will not call on you the very first day."

So, as we all recall, it is something of a disappointment when we reach Washington not to find a delegation and a brass band at Union Station to welcome us to the National Capital. And by some oversight there is no note from the President asking us to hurry down to the White House before unpacking. Most surprising of all, there is nothing in the morning papers about our arrival on the national scene. And when our committee meets we are not elected chairman. It is then we discover there is some sort of conspiracy by the old fellows who have been hanging around the Capitol for several years to keep a young man down. They refuse to recognize ability. And we immediately perceive that the system is all wrong. Let me assure these ardent young Members we have all been through it. It is an old story. Do not take it too hard.

These "old duffers," like you, have come up the hard way. They have not only been through your experience but they have repeated it many times—the



odds against them growing heavier each time as they gradually accumulate from year to year inevitable opposition and antagonism growing out of requests for services they are unable to render and the unreasoning slogan, "It is time for a change." In the average congressional district there are at least a hundred able men who every 2 years covertly appraise their chances of defeating the sitting Congressman. Everyone of them would file in the primary if he thought he had a chance to win. They have many advantages in such a contest. The Congressman is constantly on the rack. He must vote on every controversial question before the Nation. On every roll call he must alienate large numbers of his constituents who disagree with him. He must daily confess his inability to find jobs, to secure discharges, to modify the mail service, to provide appropriations for roads, dams, and Federal buildings in his district. In a thousand ways he must fall short of the expectations of his friends and constituents in failing to accomplish the impossible and then must so ably serve his district and his country as to be able to overcome this growing handicap at every election. And yet there are those who in the press and over the air and on this floor insist that because he has had the capacity to retain his seat in Congress over all actual and prospective competitors through many elections, he is an incompetent moron and disqualified from presiding over a committee.

Time and experience are necessary to give the Nation effective service in Congress. James R. Mann, of Illinois, universally conceded to be the greatest and most effective Parliamentarian who ever sat in the American Congress, said: "I did not open my mouth for the first 2 years I was a Member of the House." On the other hand, William Murray—"Alfalfa Bill"—of Oklahoma, a man of exceptional native capacity who had served his State as president of its constitutional convention, speaker of its house of representatives, and Governor, convulsed the House with derisive merriment when he attempted to debate a point of order a short time after he came to Congress.

Let our impatient young friends, who are so eager to take over the ship of state, serve an apprenticeship as Webster and Calhoun and Lincoln and Truman and Rayburn did before dismissing all the elder statesmen and heading the old ship out to sea in these critical times. Let them serve for a time as seamen "before the mast" before essaying to push the admiral off the quarterdeck.

Seniority, based upon the capacity of men to demonstrate such a high order of statesmanship as to warrant their return to Congress over growing opposition, election after election, offers the only practical system of priority in House and committee procedure.

Seniority settles harmoniously the problem of priorities without dispute or controversy and without jeopardizing morale. Abolition of the rule would be followed by logrolling, factional fights, and political trading on a grand scale.

And I am reading from a recent book on the subject:

The danger that committee places would go to those who were chosen with specific bills or policies in mind would be real and would be suspected even when it did not exist. The bitter personal feeling engendered by an open contest would complicate party management and there would be a delay in beginning work until personal and sectional quarrels could be smoothed out.

It is difficult to conceive of anything that would have a more disastrous effect on the work of a committee than a continuous potential rivalry between half a dozen members of the committee as to which of them would be made chairman in the next session, or in event of a sooner change. The entire membership of the committee would be immediately divided into factions. There would be such continuous maneuvering for position and such suspicion of every move by any faction, however inconsequential, as to seriously impede the work of the committee and prejudice its conclusions. No chairman, however qualified, could secure maximum results in such an atmosphere.

On the other hand, the present system of seniority has been in effect so long no one gives any particular attention as to who is presiding, or who will preside in the future. The system is understood and respected. Attention is concentrated on the work of the committee. The difference between the seniority system and any alternative system is the difference between order and chaos.

But let us take up the one issue on which all reformers of Congress and all streamliners and renovators of congressional procedure are agreed—the number of committees. We are told that the foundations of free government, the preservation of democracy, and the maintenance of American institutions rests on the number of committees. According to newspaper and magazine statements, if the number of committees is reduced the Republic is safe; if the number of committees is not reduced all hope is gone.

Now what would be accomplished by the reduction of the number of committees? Would there be less work? No. Would the reduction of the number of committees reduce the number of men required to do the work of the committees? No. The reduction of the number of committees would neither reduce the amount of work nor increase the number of men to do the work. In other words, whether you have 10 committees or a hundred committees, you have the same amount of work and the same number of men to do the work. And you would follow the same system of handling the work.

The only difference would be that instead of doing the work in committees, as at present, it would be done by subcommittees made up of the same men. As soon as you combine the 48 committees of the House into 18 committees, you immediately appoint 48 subcommittees. For example, one of the stock arguments in favor of consolidation of com-

mittees is that we have three committees dealing with pensions. They fail to note that each of the three committees deals with an entirely different phase of pensions, deals with a different class of beneficiaries, different periods of service, different statutory enactments. The three do not conflict or overlap in any way. So when you consolidate, instead of having three committees and three chairmen, you have one committee and three subcommittees and three subchairmen. The same would be true of every consolidation of committees in the reform.

Now, if a man does the work why should he not have the credit? A chairman of a subcommittee will have to do identically the work he now does as chairman of a committee. Why should he not have a chairmanship?

A manufacturer who operated his plant successfully during the war was awarded an E, and it was conferred with great ceremony. A scholar who has distinguished himself in his particular field is given a doctor of laws degree. An Army or naval officer serving creditably at his desk here in Washington is awarded a bronze star or a promotion. Why should not a man who has served faithfully and effectively through the years here on this floor have some slight recognition? Why should he not have a chairmanship? Under the proposed change—with only 18 committees—men will come here and serve a lifetime, and though they give the Nation the most distinguished service, will never reach a chairmanship. They will do the same work, their subcommittees will do the same work, but there will be no recognition.

"Oh," they say, "one Member is serving on half a dozen committees. He cannot attend them all." He can at least choose those in whose work he is most interested. If he was on one or two, he would be confined to the work of those committees. As a matter of fact, conflicts between any two committees to which a Member may be assigned can usually be arranged if he requests it. Assignment to a number of committees gives him a wider range of work and usefulness than if he is limited to one or two.

And much is made of the statement that some two or three men from the departments have been called to testify before a number of committees on the same subject matter. The more often they are called to testify the better—the closer the relation between the executive and legislative branches, the better opportunity for the executive to judge the reaction to his testimony and the more searchingly the committee can scrutinize the operations of the bureaus of the Government. The complainers complain because the representatives of the executive branch are called to testify so frequently and then they complain because there is not a closer relation between the two branches of the Government. The time of the representatives of the departments is not so valuable that they cannot come before the congressional committees and subcommittees whenever requested—and the more frequently the better.

So all this hullabaloo about the number of committees is pointless and misleading. Reduction of the number of committees would not affect the situation. The same men would still do the same work and do it no better and no worse. There would be no advantages to offset the disadvantages.

Connected with the question of committee structure is the proposal to make further unnecessary and more expensive additions to committee staffs. In this connection the report reflects on the system which has been in use by the Committee on Appropriations for more than three years. The system has been too often discussed here on the floor to require further justification. Suffice to say it has met every requirement. No information has been requested which it did not supply and its cost of maintenance in comparison with service rendered has been the smallest in the history of congressional investigations. The Drafting Service of the Congress has met every requirement. I have never yet heard of a request for service which they have failed to supply. The Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library has likewise supplied every need. If any of these research services has failed in its functions, no one has called it to the attention of the House. I have frequently asked on the floor, and in the committee, when complaint was made of lack of research facility, "What information does the gentleman desire? What does he want investigated?" And in no instance has the complainant ever been able to specify any date desired or any particular subject or agency he wanted investigated or on which needed information could not be obtained. If they happen to need further funds at any time, the Committee on Appropriations will provide them in the future, as in the past, on the authority of the legislative committees having jurisdiction, without the report of a special committee. The recommendation for a stenographic pool and an \$8,000 assistant for each Congressman borders on the preposterous.

The recommendation that salaries of Members be increased and privileges of retirement be provided has a somewhat more sinister connotation. We witnessed here yesterday the extraordinary spectacle of a determined effort by members of the streamlining committee to restrict all proposals relative to salaries and retirement annuities of Congressmen to the bill recommended by the streamlining committee—for the frankly announced purpose of baiting and sugar-coating such a bill to the extent that Congressmen would be induced to vote for all committee proposals in order to secure larger pay and retirement privileges for themselves. Surely there must be a dearth of merit in the committee proposals if the committee feel that it is necessary to resort to such questionable means of securing consideration of their recommendations, and the streamlining committee does not encourage a very flattering opinion of the membership of the House in suggesting so broadly that

Congressmen can be cajoled into supporting its measures for a remunerary consideration—in order to get an increase in pay.

Perhaps the most extraordinary recommendation by the streamlining committee is that relating to fiscal control:

**Recommendation:** That by joint action the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses submit to the Congress within 60 days after each session opens (or by April 15) a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal receipts and expenditures estimated for the coming fiscal year. If total expenditures recommended exceed estimated income, Congress should be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations, excepting those of a permanent nature, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions and benefits, trust expenditures, and public-debt retirement, would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved budget figure.

Let us consider the effect of such a recommendation. If observed, it could only mean committing the Congress to a budget in advance of detailed consideration. It would be physically impossible to conduct adequate hearings in the time proposed.

Following the committee's recommendation through, after having voted more or less blindly on a ceiling, there would be lessened interest in affecting reductions in the estimates for the several Federal agencies on the part of the committee and the House. It is difficult to appraise such a proposal in any other light than that of discouraging economies rather than that of contributing to economies.

The provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act are much more practical and effective:

If the estimated receipts for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, on the basis of laws existing at the time the budget is transmitted, plus the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year in progress, available for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal year, are less than the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, the President in the budget shall make recommendations to Congress for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the estimated deficiency.

As to supplemental or deficiency estimates, it further provides:

Whenever such supplemental or deficiency estimates reach an aggregate which, if they had been contained in the budget, would have required the President to make a recommendation under subdivision (a) of section 202, he shall thereupon make such recommendation.

This is the law today. It leaves the door open to reductions determined upon after searching inquiry, and it carries the incentive to so curb appropriations as to avoid the need for new taxes, loans, or other means of avoiding deficit spending.

The tendency of the proposal carried in the report of the streamlining committee would be to lessen the interest of Members of the Congress generally in appropriations other than those particular items in which there was a direct interest.

There is too great a tendency in this direction as it is. Appropriation bills go through too quickly. There is too much reliance on the committee reports and too much dependence on the recommendation of the committee. Under the rules the committee merely reports its recommendations as an agent of the House. The presumption is that these recommendations will be sharply scrutinized and subjected to critical analysis when taken up for consideration on the floor. Every bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be carefully reviewed and, if necessary, amended by the House. In the last analysis it is the responsibility of the House and the country profits to the degree that responsibility is exercised. The House works through its committees, but committees may, and do, err at times, and the House should not rely too implicitly on its committees' recommendations. The final responsibility is here on this floor. The suggestion of the streamlining committee would not emphasize this responsibility. Under its proposal, Members of Congress could without compunction vote against all tax bills and for all appropriation bills. And it would always be possible under such procedure to include in any appropriation for popular projects, such as flood control, a provision that the amount provided for such purpose be not included in the list when the percentage reduction is applied.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the time to dwell too long on these questions of technical procedure. They are comparatively inconsequential. The frenzied vituperation of sensationalists to the contrary notwithstanding, the Congress can be depended upon to do its work and do it well—as it has been doing it with particular efficiency during the war sessions.

The important thing is to stop all this byplay and stop alarming the country. If there are minor defects which need adjustment, let us make them—preferably on consideration and recommendation by the committee having jurisdiction—and have the matter over with and stop prejudicing the public against the legislative branch of the Government and against their Representatives in the House and Senate.

It would be unfair to the press and the country not to include here, along with the unbridled criticisms which have been quoted, some of the sane appraisals of the Congress in general, and this Congress in particular.

Here is one by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

Anything that brings Congress into disrepute weakens the fabric of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in recent years has so disturbed the public and so shaken their confidence in, and their regard for, their Government as this campaign to capitalize on the general lack of knowledge of the minutiae of congressional procedure.



Here is a comment from Fulton Lewis, Jr., one of the most reliable of the commentators of the day:

The Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die last night. It was a good Congress, a very good Congress, probably the best and most courageous Congress that we have known since the days of the last World War, and perhaps for even longer than that. It did more to revive and restore the dignity and integrity and the prestige of the legislative branch of the American Government than any other Congress in many, many decades. We might well give it a salute of a job well done, and we might dub it, in congressional history, the Great Seventy-eighth.

Let me also include a pertinent comment from Labor, one of the prominent labor journals of the Nation:

We shouldn't make radical changes without mature reflection and until we are certain we have a better system. Labor still believes that the best way to streamline Congress is to elect the right kind of men to the House and Senate. They will always find a way to enact desirable legislation.

And here is a considered opinion by one of the outstanding historians of our times, Prof. Charles A. Beard:

After studying the operations of the First Congress of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for the absence of corruption and concern with the public good, the present body is of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the United States Government collected more money, borrowed more money, spent more money, and created a greater deficit than any government in any country has ever collected, borrowed, spent, or owed in human history. It is a world record. And in 1945, Congress rescinded more appropriations, reclaimed more money, and made greater reductions in expenditures than was ever effected by any government before in fiscal history. That likewise is a world record. And in all this accumulation and disbursement of wealth—in amounts beyond the capacity of the finite mind of man to comprehend—there has been less unwarranted expenditure, diversion, and waste in proportion to the amounts involved, and results secured, than ever before since government was established among men.

In all the annals of the past there is no parliamentary body which has borne such heavy responsibilities, administered such vast empires of production and distribution, and discharged its duties so faultlessly as the war Congress of the United States. The American people are to be congratulated on the efficiency and integrity with which their representatives in Congress have successfully met the problems created by a war of extermination with the mightiest war machines modern science and military proficiency could create.

It is a great Congress—and it could not have operated so satisfactorily without a great system of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 142, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]  
YEAS—230

Abernethy	Fugate	Noland
Addonizio	Furcolo	Norrell
Albert	Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, La.	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Gilmer	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Gordon	O'Neill
Bailey	Gorski, Ill.	O'Sullivan
Barden	Gorski, N. Y.	O'Toole
Baring	Gossett	Pace
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Patman
Battle	Grant	Patten
Beckworth	Green	Perkins
Bentsen	Gregory	Peterson
Blemliller	Hardy	Pickett
Bland	Hare	Poage
Blatnik	Harris	Polk
Boggs, La.	Havener	Preston
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Price
Bolton, Md.	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Bonner	Hedrick	Quinn
Bosone	Heffernan	Rabaut
Boykin	Herlong	Rains
Breen	Hobbs	Ramsay
Brooks	Hollfield	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Redden
Bryson	Huber	Regan
Buchanan	Irving	Rhodes
Buckley, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Burke	Jacobs	Richards
Burleson	Javits	Rodino
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Burton	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Camp	Jones, N. C.	Sabath
Cannon	Karst	Sadowksi
Carlyle	Karsten	Sasser
Carnahan	Kelley	Sheppard
Carroll	Keogh	Sikes
Cavalcante	Kerr	Smathers
Chatham	King	Spence
Chief	Kirwan	Stagers
Chesney	Klein	Stanley
Christopher	Kruse	Steed
Chudoff	Lane	Stigler
Clemente	Lanham	Sullivan
Coffey	Larcade	Sutton
Colmer	Lesinski	Tackett
Combs	Lind	Tauriello
Cooper	Linehan	Teague
Cox	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Crook	Lyle	Thompson
Crosser	Lynch	Thornberry
Davies, N. Y.	McCarthy	Trimble
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Underwood
Dawson	McGrath	Vinson
Deane	McGuire	Wadsworth
DeGraffenried	McKinnon	Wagner
Delaney	McMillan, S. C.	Walsh
Denton	McSweeney	Walter
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Welch, Calif.
Donohue	Madden	Welch, Mo.
Doughton	Magee	Wheeler
Douglas	Mahon	White, Calif.
Doyle	Mansfield	Whitten
Durham	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Eberharter	Marsalis	Wier
Elliott	Marshall	Williams
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Willis
Evins	Mitchell	Wilson, Okla.
Fallon	Monroney	Wilson, Tex.
Feighan	Morgan	Winstead
Fernandez	Morris	Wood
Fisher	Morrison	Woodhouse
Flood	Moulder	Worley
Fogarty	Multer	Yates
Forand	Murdock	Zablocki
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—142

Allen, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Fenton
Andersen,	Case, N. J.	Ford
H. Carl	Church	Gamble
Anderson, Calif.	Clevenger	Gavin
Andresen,	Cole, Kans.	Gillette
August H.	Cole, N. Y.	Golden
Angell	Corbett	Goodwin
Arends	Cotton	Graham
Auchincloss	Crawford	Gross
Barrett, Wyo.	Cunningham	Hagen
Bates, Mass.	Curtis	Hale
Beall	Dague	Hall
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Edwin Arthur
Bishop	D'Ewart	Hall
Boggs, Del.	Dolliver	Leonard W.
Bolton, Ohio	Dondero	Halleck
Bramblett	Eaton	Hand
Brehm	Elston	Harden
Brown, Ohio	Engel, Mich.	Harvey
Burdick	Fellows	Hesilton

Hill	McMillen, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Hinshaw	Mack, Wash.	St. George
Hoever	Martin, Mass.	Sanborn
Hoffman, Mich.	Mason	Scrivner
Holmes	Merrow	Scudder
Hope	Michener	Shafer
Horan	Miller, Md.	Short
Hull	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Ill.
Jackson, Calif.	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
James	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Kans.
Jenkins	Nelson	Smith, Wis.
Jennings	Nicholson	Stefan
Jensen	Nixon	Stockman
Johnson	Norblad	Taber
Judd	O'Hara, Minn.	Talle
Kean	O'Konski	Tollefson
Kearney	Patterson	Towe
Keating	Pfeiffer	Van Zandt
Kilburn	William L.	Velde
Kunkel	Phillips	Vorys
LeCompte	Phillips, Calif.	Vursell
LeFevre	Phillips, Tenn.	Welchel
Lemke	Piumley	Werdel
Lodge	Potter	Wigglesworth
Lovre	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
McConnell	Reed, N. Y.	Withrow
McCulloch	Rees	Wolcott
McDonough	Rich	Wolverton
McGregor	Riehlman	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—61

Abbt	Gwinn	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Harrison	Pfeifer
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Joseph L.
Blackney	Hébert	Powell
Bloom	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Jenison	Sadlak
Byrne, N. Y.	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Canfield	Kearns	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kee	Hugh D., Jr.
Celler	Keefe	Secrest
Chiperfield	Kennedy	Sims
Cooley	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Latham	Smith, Va.
Davenport	Lichtenwalter	Somers
Davis, Tenn.	Macy	Taylor
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Meyer	Whitaker
Fulton	Miles	White, Idaho
Gary	Miller, Calif.	Whittington
Gore	Murphy	Young

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Coudert against.  
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Canfield against.  
Mr. Whittington for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Jonas against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Meyer against.  
Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Young for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.  
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Sadlak against.  
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Jenison against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Blackney.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Latham.  
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Keefe.  
Mr. Somers with Mr. Herter.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin of Iowa.  
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Case of South Dakota.  
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Gore with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1949.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of this week while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2361) providing for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2361, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under unanimous consent agreement, debate is limited to 2 hours, one-half of which will be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and the other half under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Members of the House of Representatives, it becomes my duty and respon-

sibility as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to present at this time for your consideration H. R. 2361, a bill for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes. I consider it a high privilege to stand before you in this capacity, first, because of the nature and the composition of the committee of which it is my good fortune to be the chairman. To my mind there is no more hard-working committee in all this Congress. As I think of its membership, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], our majority leader, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman], the ranking minority member, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] a member thereof, I say I think it is a high privilege to present the report of such a committee. Your committee has worked long and hard on this bill and has heard many witnesses. We believe we have brought to you a bill calculated to render to the people of this country one of the greatest services this Congress could afford, the reorganization of its Government agencies.

In the last 20 years, our Government has grown from about 350 agencies to over 1,800 bureaus and agencies. The number of employees has increased from five-hundred-and-seventy-thousand-odd to over 2,100,000. Expenses have grown from \$3,600,000,000 to more than \$42,000,000,000.

We have heard many speakers on the floor of this House during the last few years talk about the vast cost of our Government to the taxpayers of this country. When you gaze at the condition of the executive department, you can appreciate that a realignment of its agencies, the cutting down of its personnel, and the streamlining of its business, can and will result in a great saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

This plan of reorganization giving the President of the United States the power to take the initiative in bringing out a reorganization plan is nothing new. This type of reorganization has been tried in the past and has been responsible for some great gains. In bringing this bill to you, we are profiting by the experiences and the trials and errors of former bills. We believe that if this bill is adopted by the Congress and becomes a law it will be one of the greatest steps forward we have promulgated in the history of the Congress.

There is at present no law empowering the President to take the initiative in the reorganization of the executive departments. That authorization expired in 1948. So if we mean business let us get busy and give him the power to give us a reorganization plan in time for it to be considered and acted upon by the time the Congress adjourns. We ought to pass this legislation as speedily as possible.

There are certain provisions in this bill that are not found in other bills. I think the best way to present it to you, since we have had the Reorganization Act of 1945, is to call to your attention some of the differences.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for the nice things he has said about the committee, including me, and to say here and now that I am happy to be on that committee and serving with the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman has referred to the fact that if this legislation is adopted we ought to be able to proceed expeditiously with the reorganization of the Government. I agree with the gentleman in that regard. I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission, with the enactment of this legislation, and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic, as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

Mr. DAWSON. I think we ought to get reorganization plans submitted to this Congress within a very short time.

Further, I wish to say concerning our committee that there has never at any time been any question of partisan politics raised. Every member of the committee went about the job of attending to the business of the Congress as that job presented itself to him.

I refer now to page 7 of the report, setting out the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945. By and large the bill follows the 1945 act which, in turn, was largely based on the 1935 act. The major differences between this legislation and the 1945 legislation are as follows: First, that the legislation here proposed would be permanent, while the 1945 act operated for a limited time. In that connection, I want to refer to the hearings. On page 6 of the hearings there is found an excerpt from the message from the President of the United States to the Congress. That excerpt is as follows:

First, the reorganization legislation should be permanent rather than temporary. While the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government makes such legislation especially timely and essential, the improvement of the organization of the Government is a continuing and never-ending process. Government is a dynamic institution. Its administrative structure cannot be static. As new programs are established and old programs change in character and scope to meet the needs of the Nation, the organization of the executive branch must be adjusted to fit its changing tasks.

The impracticability of solving many problems of organization by the regular legislative process has been frankly recognized for many years by congressional leaders.

On page 137 of the hearings we have this statement made by Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States:

Mr. HOOPER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government, giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.



Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the purpose of this bill to create the over-all machinery under which the Hoover report may be worked into the affairs of government?

Mr. DAWSON. You are right. So that that part of the Hoover report—for which we are spending so much money—where the need is shown, may be presented to the Congress by the President. So that the President will have the power to incorporate it into his plan and present it to the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Without this kind of implementation the Hoover report could not be used?

Mr. DAWSON. It could not be used in the light of the experiences of the past.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. VORYS. Under the saving provisions of the bill on page 9 it is provided that any statute or regulation shall have the same effect as if a reorganization act had not been made except by or under authority of law by the abolition of a function.

My question is this: Could there be any change in the substantive law of the country by the abolition of a function, or by the abolition of a function would it merely mean a change in who might be required to carry out the law? It is not quite clear to me what abolition of a function means. As I understood it, this Reorganization Act is not intended to change the laws, except the organization which might enforce the law. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no question but that the act does not permit the President to submit a plan that changes the basic law. But the abolishment of a function means that where two organizations have been discharging the same function, if that function is given to one of the organizations it may be abolished as far as the other organization is concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. For instance, if two or three agencies were authorized to make loans, the combining of those functions by the abolishment of the function for a number of the agencies could not repeal the authority to make loans? Am I correct?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. So that we are not changing any substantive law in voting for this?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at all.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to say further on that point of the permanency

of the legislation, this bill is supported by the views of the only two people in the world who have had experience on the subject. The present President has had the experience of his past term. The former President had the experience of his term in office. We all know from history that no man was more interested in reorganizing the agencies in the executive department than was the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. So on the question of the permanency of the legislation, we have the testimony, in no undecided terms, of the only two men who have had actual experience. It gives the incoming President the opportunity and the power, as he becomes experienced, to suggest to the Congress any legislation combining agencies and bureaus, or for the reorganization of departments, for the good of the country that presents itself to him.

No. 2, reading from page 7 of the report:

No executive agency is exempted under this bill, while under the 1945 act a number of agencies were exempted. It is felt that exemptions, even of major regulatory commissions, would seriously hinder the reorganization effort. Many of the regulatory commissions have nonregulatory functions which appropriately might be assigned to a different type of agency.

That takes care of what has been one of the great faults in past legislation. The exempting of so many agencies and the inclusion in the bill itself of language which was not capable of clear interpretation prevented the Executive from initiating many reforms that were needed because, in his judgment, if made, it would be the occasion of many lawsuits which might continue through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

On page 7 of the hearings we have this statement in the President's message:

Second, the new reorganization act should be comprehensive in scope; no agency or function of the executive branch should be exempted from its operation. Such exemptions prevent the President and the Congress from deriving the full benefit of the reorganization-plan procedure, primarily by precluding action on major organizational problems. A seemingly limited exemption may in fact render an entire needed reorganization affecting numerous agencies and functions wholly impractical. The proper protection against the possibility of unwise reorganization lies, not in the statutory exemption from the reorganization-plan procedure, but in the authority of Congress to reject any such plan by simple majority vote of both Houses.

That quotation is taken from the President's message.

On page 135 we have the testimony of Mr. Hoover on the same subject:

I might add to this statement what I proposed that I have given here, that I strongly support the idea that there should be no exceptions in this legislation. The reasons for that view are that I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible

to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans.

So upon that change in the bill you have the testimony without question and without equivocation of the only two men who have had opportunity to try out these reorganization plans.

Continuing with the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945, I quote from the report of the committee:

(3) This bill will permit a type of reorganization not authorized under the 1945 act—the granting to any officer of authority to delegate any of his functions. The main purpose is to make it possible for top officials to delegate routine functions which are vested in them by law in such manner as to prevent delegation.

(4) The bill omits the provision of the 1945 act relating to quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions of independent agencies. The omission of this provision is in line with the recommendation of the President and the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

(5) The bill permits submission of reorganization plans with respect to the government of the District of Columbia.

(6) The bill grants broader authority to create offices made necessary by a reorganization. Under the 1945 act the new offices which could be created were only those of "heads" and "assistant heads" of agencies. The change will permit a plan to provide for the appropriate type of officer in each case.

(7) The bill differs from the 1945 act with respect to the limitation on the rate of compensation applicable to offices created by a reorganization plan.

This makes no change in salaries but merely enables the President to name salaries in compliance with executive law.

We have had the 1945 act, we have had the 1939 act. The bill under consideration differs from them only in the manner that I have stated here in talking over the matter at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Expenditures Committee, on the outstanding presentation he has made of this legislation. In bringing in this H. R. 2361 the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are indeed entitled to a great deal of commendation, particularly by reason of the complicated and complex nature of the legislation. It is a subject that should have been presented to the Congress before this session. I hope the Congress will reward this committee and also the taxpayers of the Nation by passing this legislation. I again wish to compliment the chairman of the committee for bringing in this bill.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. Dawson] correctly stated, this bill came out of the committee without any previous political discussion. No one has greater respect for the sincerity and honesty of former President Hoover than have I. Beyond question, in recommending this legislation Mr. Hoover was expressing his own ideas, being sincere and honest. And the same may be said of our present President. They both have assumed that every other President, every President who might succeed Mr. Truman, would have the same degree of sincerity and honesty.

Without in any way being personal, it might be suggested to the House that some day we might get a Wallace with a Wallace Senate or a Wallace House. The results that might then come out of this legislation if left in its present form might not only be surprising but astounding to the people of the country.

There is no question but that a reorganization of the executive department is needed. It may be assumed that the failure of previous Congresses and of the present Congress up to this time to enact legislation similar to this is due—and please note this—either to the lack of ability, the lack of information, or the lack of courage on the part of the Members of Congress. Something has always been lacking, because everyone concedes that there must be a reorganization.

Starting with the premise that to serve the people we must have reorganization, and assuming that the Congress will not act if left to itself, where do we go from there? I am in favor of everything this proposed legislation seeks to do, but I want it done in a constitutional way. I do not want to surrender the powers of the Congress to accomplish something that is vitally needed, unless it is necessary to save our national security. Unless our national security is presently threatened, I cannot support the proposed legislation unless we can preserve the legislative powers of the Congress.

This bill, as previous reorganization acts, provides that the President of the United States may submit a plan to the Congress, that upon the expiration of 60 consecutive legislative days the plan so submitted to the Congress shall become the law of the land unless within the 60 days both Houses of the Congress have vetoed it.

This plan not only ignores the constitutional provision that the legislative power is vested in the Congress, but goes farther than that. It reverses the legislative procedure. This plan provides that the President shall submit, and his ideas and his suggestions become the law of the land unless each House within 60 days overrides, vetoes, if you please, what he sends down here. Now, is there any necessity for that? None at all. But, say the advocates of this bill, the Congress will not act if left to itself. Well, assume that to be true. It is not necessary that we leave the Congress to itself to refuse to act.

When this bill comes before the House under the 5-minute rule an amendment will be proposed which will state—and it follows the language of the bill on page 7, section 6—that the plan submitted by the President must be acted upon by both Houses of Congress within 60 days,

and that to become the law of the land it must receive the sanction of the two Houses of Congress.

Is there any reason why, having been elected as the people's representatives, having taken the oath here before the Speaker when we were sworn that we would uphold the provisions of the Constitution, that we should not follow that procedure?

It is quite true that section 3 of article II provides that the President shall annually advise the Congress on the state of the Union and that he may on any occasion recommend to the Congress the measures which he considers necessary or good for the national welfare. But the Constitution also says in the very first sentence of section 1 of article I that the legislative power is vested in the Congress which shall consist of a House of Representatives and a Senate.

Section 7 states in no uncertain terms that no bill shall go to the President until it has received a majority of the votes of the Members of each House.

Now, my colleagues, I ask you: Are we to follow through and perform the duty which our constituents impose upon us, and which is marked out sentence by sentence in the Constitution itself? Or are we to delegate our legislative power to the President reserving to ourselves only the right of veto?

If there were a great national emergency threatening immediately the security of our Nation we might waive the constitutional provisions on the ground of necessity.

Assuming that, in order to preserve our constitutional form of government, we must overcome this waste, this inefficiency, it is not necessary that we do it in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the provisions of the pending legislation a bare majority of the two Houses could reject within 60 days after receiving the President's proposal any proposal that he might make, but once the proposal is accepted and it becomes law, then it would require a two-thirds majority in both Houses in order to overcome the President's veto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true and is just an added reason why we should amend the bill, but do it now. There is not a schoolboy who has ever taken a look at the Constitution, if you ask him the question: "How does a bill become law when a bill is presented to the Congress?" but who would say: "Well, it must pass the House of Representatives, it must have a majority vote in the Senate," would he not? Sure. Then it goes to the President and he may veto it, he may pocket it, and then the procedure of two-thirds follows, and it becomes the law of the land.

I want to go along with this legislation. We need the reorganization. The Congress, as stated before, and I repeat it, has heretofore lacked either the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job. It has not been done. I am willing to have the President send down any plan he may wish—and I do not

care whether you make any exemptions in this bill of this or that department, or agency. I care nothing about that. I am not so particularly concerned about whether the legislation is limited or permanent. All that I ask is that we do not delegate the power specified in the Constitution as belonging exclusively to the Congress to the Executive or any other grantee.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whom I respect highly, has stated that Congress lacks the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job of reorganization. While I do not care to endorse that statement, I do say that in 160 years of historical record Congress has failed to take affirmative action for the type of reorganization which all of us, including the gentleman from Michigan, admit is desirable in the executive branch. So notwithstanding any technical assertions that Congress should do the job, the fact remains that Congress has not done the job, and every attempt on the part of Congress to take affirmative action to do a good job, a complete job of reorganization of the executive branch, has miserably failed.

Ex-President Hoover, in appearing before our committee, pointed out the reason for that. He said there are 1,800 agencies in the executive branch, and he pointed out that it is clearly impossible for Congress, with all of its other duties, to go into the highly technical and complicated structure of every department and agency of Government and do the job of reorganization that has been found to be necessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be pointed out, as distinguished from the present situation, that when Mr. Hoover submitted those recommendations Congress was not of his political faith. Of course, that situation does not prevail now, as far as the Chief Executive and Congress are concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not see where that has any bearing on the record of 160 years of the failure of Congress to do a reorganization job, nor do I see where it has anything to do with the size of the job that needs to be done.

We all realize that reorganization plans are desirable. We realize that Congress has not been able to do it by affirmative action. So I consider that it is highly constitutional for the Congress to delegate within certain limits the job of reorganization. We merely say to the President, "Avail yourself of the tremendous value of the 24 task-force reports to the Hoover Commission, and whatever subsequent reports and recommendations the Hoover Commission will make based on those 24 task-force reports. Then, after considering all this material, the procuring of which was endorsed by the Eightieth Congress when we set up the so-called Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission has been in session now for over 18 months and



has spent over \$1,000,000, with over 300 of the finest technicians in Government that we could procure, sending up to the Congress plans, not one plan, but several plans." Then, I say we will have a firm base upon which a worth-while reorganization of the executive branch of Government can take place.

When the President sends up a plan the Congress then has 60 days in which to consider the plan. If we find out that there is something bad about the plan we have in title 2 of this bill a highly privileged resolution which can be offered on the floor by any Member of the Congress who is in favor of a resolution to disapprove the plan. Any Member of Congress can arise under high privilege and ask that a vote be taken on a particular plan and provision is made for 1 hour of debate on that question. Any committee that is affected by this plan, let us say that it is a plan with reference to the Department of Agriculture, immediately the Committee on Agriculture is on guard concerning this plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. Thus the Committee on Agriculture can consider that plan. It can ask for hearings. The hearings can be had in the Committee on Executive Expenditures. The chairman or any member of the Committee on Agriculture can come before that committee and present its case. Then, if the committee itself refuses to bring forward a resolution of disapproval, any member of the Committee on Agriculture can bring to the floor of the House for the consideration of the House a concurrent resolution of disapproval and the House at that time can hear the arguments pro and con and vote it up or down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite true, I assume, as the gentleman said, that any Member of the House can arise and propose the disapproval of a plan submitted. Assuming that the House does disapprove, unless we can get the other body to go along, the proposal still becomes the law of the land, does it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. If we pass a bill in this body it has to go to the other body and they have to consider it. If they do not take it up, what can we do? Furthermore, this provision that any Member can call it up as a matter of high privilege within 10 days after the reorganization plan comes up will apply to the other body the same as it applies to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the difference is that the reorganization plan still becomes the law of the land without the action of one body while in the case of a bill it must have the approval of both Houses to become law. You gentlemen realize the difference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out, however, that that approval is a majority approval. In the case of a bill

which has been vetoed by the President and sent down here, it takes two-thirds vote of the House to override the veto. It seems to me this is a very well-balanced arrangement, that only a majority of each House is necessary to disapprove a plan. I point out to you that if a plan is so highly undesirable, certainly the Congress of the United States can at that time exercise its responsibility and by a majority vote of each House disapprove such a plan. I point to the record. Such a thing did occur six times out of seven in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, that particular provision is nothing new in a reorganization bill, and it was in the one which expired in April.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly so. That is the one I just referred to. Seven reorganization plans were sent to the House by the President under the Reorganization Act of 1945, and six of them were disapproved by majority action of both Houses. There is no use bringing up a straw man here and then knocking it over. We have the best bill that has ever been presented to the Congress, so far as reorganization is concerned. It gives the President, for the first time in history, the power to go ahead and use this great mass of information compiled by the Hoover Commission, and bring before the Congress plans for our approval or disapproval. Plans which we cannot originate in the House with all of the business that we have to attend to and with all of the logrolling and pressure from groups which are concerned with every facet of every bureau of the great sprawling bureaucracy of government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming that this bill should become law, the Congress could later repeal the law if it decided it should do so, could it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. Any part of this plan which becomes law can be nullified. I point out that in the Reorganization Act of 1932 it gave to President Roosevelt great powers, and that later on, in 1933, such action was taken and a limitation was placed upon his power.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Another outstanding contribution in the progress of the history of this legislation—and I want to congratulate the members of the committee on both sides—is the fact that it is permanent legislation, recognizing that this is a problem not for a matter of a year or 2 or 3 or 4 years, but one that is constantly arising, and in which we, the majority party—I speak for myself—have complete confidence. We may disagree with the President of the United States, but I have complete confidence in whoever may be the President of the United States, recognizing the serious responsibility of that office, that any man in that office would carry on to the highest degree humanly possible in the exercise of his best judgment in the interest of the country. I think it is a

marked contribution in the progress of legislation of this kind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The Congress has delegated to the President broad authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government five times in the past 17 years. The bill which we present to you today is the sixth presentation of a reorganization bill within the past 17 years. Under all of these reorganization acts, Congress has delegated to the President power to reorganize, on the grounds of economy and efficiency, the sprawling, complicated structure of Government in the executive departments. We have delegated this authority because we have been forced to come to the conclusion that Congress has neither the time nor the ability for unified action to successfully accomplish a reorganization in the executive branch. This principle of lack of ability to execute a real reorganization has been well established and we are setting no precedent today.

The administration of the laws which Congress has passed has become more complicated and burdensome as bureau after bureau has been established and expanded, and as the personnel of the executive branch has multiplied from a few thousand to nearly 2,000,000 governmental employees.

The reorganization acts which Congress has passed have varied in some degree over the years, but one prime purpose has been contained in each of these acts: That purpose has been to delegate to the President authority to do a job which we in the Congress admit that we cannot do. Congress, however, has been fearful in the delegation of this authority, that such delegation would be abused. The Congress has in the past, also, yielded to its fears, and in some instances has been influenced by the tremendous pressures which have been brought on Congress to exempt certain agencies of Government completely from the President's delegated power to reorganize.

In the 1939 Reorganization Act, we exempted 21 agencies of the executive branch from Presidential reorganization; in the 1945 Reorganization Act, we exempted 11 agencies from reorganization. All students of government recognize that these exemptions have crippled the President and have tied his hands in his effort to set up an economical and efficient structure of Government in the executive departments.

Experts in governmental organization have assured us, after careful and objective analysis that these exemptions have prevented, to a lesser or greater extent, the main purpose of a reorganization act.

The present Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had the same experience as previous committees charged with the responsibility of reporting a reorganization act. Witnesses have appeared before our committee from outside the Congress, and from inside the Congress, making pleas for the exemptions of special departments of Government. We have listened to their pleas, and, in some instances, our personal feelings have been

sympathetic to their arguments, and to their positions. We have also had before our committee, some very notable witnesses, who have insisted that this time the Congress give to the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of Government and to send to the Congress his plan of reorganization, in order that we may curb the sprawling, overlapping, duplicating bureaus of Government which have grown Topsylike in the executive departments of our Government.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message, and in his special letter to the committee, has requested that we give him complete power to present to the Congress, efficient plans of reorganization, which will bring the economy into our Government functions that public opinion is clamoring for. He has asked that we make no exemptions in the pending bill.

The only living ex-President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, has also appeared before our committee, and has asked this committee to report a bill without exemptions. He has testified that it is only in this way that a real reorganization can be accomplished. The testimony of ex-President Herbert Hoover bears additional weight at this time because, as chairman of the so-called Hoover commission, which was instituted during the Eightieth Congress for the express purpose of studying our Government structure and reporting back to the Congress, is now ready to start making its report to the President.

I understand that 24 separate task forces have made their reports to the Hoover commission. The Hoover commission will base their report to the President on these 24 task-forces reports. President Truman will, in turn, no doubt, base the reorganization plans which he will send to Congress on the reports of the Hoover commission. In the establishment of the Hoover commission, Congress acknowledged the weight of public opinion on this pressing problem. Approximately 18 months' time has been consumed and upward of a million dollars spent on objective analyses of the different departments of Government. Following these objective analyses, the task forces have made their reports to the commission. The commission, as you know, is completely bipartisan in its approach to this great problem. If we are to cash in on the value of the most extensive study which has ever been made of our sprawling Federal bureaucracy, now is the time.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has presented to this Congress a good bill—a bill which we believe will give the President the power to proceed in an orderly fashion—prepare the reorganization plans to present to the Congress for approval or disapproval.

Today's bill does not contain the exemption of any executive department or agency of Government. We have, however, recognized the great concern felt by many Members of the Congress in changes in certain very important executive departments. We have, therefore, prepared what we believe is a fair compromise approach between those who

want no exemption and those who want exemptions.

We have provided that any plan affecting the National Defense Establishment, which everyone admits needs reorganization, be sent to the Congress in a single reorganization plan. This will enable the Congress to review such a plan without having to consider the merits or demerits of any accompanying reorganization plan. We can then, in the exercise of our judgment, either accept or reject such a plan. This provision, we believe, will meet the fears and the concern which many Members have expressed regarding changes in the status of the Marine Corps or in the civil function of the Army engineers or the Navy air arm or other related matters to our national defense.

We have extended this same separate treatment to three other agencies of the executive branch: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In the opinion of the committee, these three great bureaus can be considered to be the vital keystones to our financial and business structure. Upon them rests the economic welfare of our Nation. We, therefore, believe that these three agencies should have separate treatment. Many other agencies of Government are vitally important and there will be many who believe that these should also be considered separately. However, it was the opinion of the committee that the functions of the other agencies were not so widespread nor as important as the three bureaus or agencies named, and it was also believed that in many cases more than one agency could be handled by the Congress in the same reorganization plan.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the committee has worked diligently and certainly with expedition in bringing this matter to the floor. I think it is obvious to all of us that this is basic legislation and must be enacted if the proposals that we hope will be forthcoming for the reorganization of the Government may be adopted.

Of course, those proposals that have been the subject of study by the Hoover Commission for months and months are the direct result of action taken by the Eightieth Congress in setting up that commission, recognizing that basically a job had to be done.

I assume, of course, that this legislation will be passed and that it will become law in some final form that will be effective.

May I say to my friends on the right side of the aisle and my friends on my side of the aisle that, as these recommendations of the President begin to come up, we are going to find that we have a great responsibility before us. Certainly, to those of you who hold the majority power, the matter is up to you, and may I say the baby is going to be on your doorstep. Certainly those of us who think that we need reorganization badly are going to look to you to meet

the issue and the challenge with courage and with wisdom and with fair consideration to the people of the country who pay the bills.

I have asked for this time particularly because there is one thing that has disturbed me. It has disturbed me ever since these matters of reorganization to be initiated by the executive branch of the Government have been before the Congress. That has to do with the way they may affect the great quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agencies of the Government. By that I refer to such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Tariff Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Civil Functions of the Army Engineers, and a number of others that could be mentioned. Those agencies are primarily, in my view, the creatures of the Congress of the United States. Theirs is the responsibility to administer in the public-welfare legislation enacted by the Congress.

The members of those commissions are appointed for a term. The members of the commissions do not change when the administration changes. Since they are appointed for a term they go on. There is a continuity of their operations. They deal with the very lifeblood of the country; with the economy of the country. If there is, for instance, in the Interstate Commerce Commission a continuity of pattern and determination about the rates involved in transportation then, of course, the people of the country may know and understand from time to time what those operations are to be and what the action ought to be. Certainly, it seems to me that it would be disastrous indeed if we were to bring about a situation under which the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of this great agency should be brought into the executive branch of the Government in such manner that their operations become political instead of nonpolitical.

Take, for instance, the matter of the Federal Communications Commission. You may say that this is a completely far-fetched proposition, but it could happen. Suppose that the functions of the Federal Communications Commission were transferred to the Department of Commerce; you might have a situation under which radio licenses issued to stations might, on a pure political basis, be changed. People build up great businesses on the issuance of a license. They are to have that license as long as they use it in the public interest. And that is the value and the merit and the function of such a commission. As I say, it would be inconceivable to my mind that any such result would be brought about, but certainly there are some in the country and I am afraid some in the Government who would argue that even the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of those great agencies should be brought within the realm of the executive branch of the Government and, hence, subjected to political control. In the previous reorganizations that we have considered some of those agencies have been specifically exempted. It is argued, and I can understand with what force, that it is difficult in respect to any agency to



distinguish the executive functions from the legislative or judicial functions. I recognize that and certainly I, for one, want to write the kind of basic legislation that will make effective reorganization possible. But the fact that there was concern about what might happen to these agencies under this system by which in effect, unless the provision is amended, legislation is written by the executive branch and one branch of the Congress, not two, there should be some safeguard. So some of these agencies in the past have been exempted. In the act passed in 1945 there were certain exemptions. I think probably it has been pretty well agreed on the advice of Mr. Hoover and others that such exemptions should be kept out of this bill. It is said that no President would think of transferring to the executive branch of the Government these great legislative and judicial functions performed by these agencies. But it has been urged, and I find myself in that school of thought, that the pattern that is provided in this legislation under which the reorganization plans regarding four such independent agencies must come up separately and independent of the plans effecting any other reorganization might well be extended to some of these other agencies.

This does not mean that reorganization plans in respect to those agencies cannot be presented here by the President to be acted upon in whatever manner may be finally prescribed in the House. It simply would require that that plan as it affected one of these great independent agencies should come up here standing on its own bottom. You understand that if this legislation is adopted and a reorganization proposal comes up it might have five or six titles. One of them may be bad; all the rest of them may be good, but you cannot pick the good apples out of the barrel and leave the bad ones; you have got to take the whole barrel or leave the whole barrel.

I cannot see how it really would interfere with the effective functioning of this legislation to extend to some of these other agencies the same protection that is contained in the bill on page 7 in subsection (b).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If a situation like the gentleman said should occur, where five different plans are treated within the same reorganization plan, four of them being good and one of them being bad in the judgment of Congress, would it not be possible for the Congress to take affirmative action to nullify that part of the plan later on after the whole plan had been passed or accepted as law? Could not the Congress exercise its responsibility by taking affirmative action as to that particular agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana two additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I may say to the gentleman from California, I suppose if a plan came up here with five titles, that

might be done. Of course, it could not be the Interstate Commerce Commission because that is included in the four. But take the case of the Civil Aeronautics Board which regulates air carriers like the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates surface carriers. We could adopt the whole thing, then turn around and start legislation through the mill to reestablish the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But, may I say to the gentleman from California, it seems to me that that begs the question. First of all, such action would be subject to a Presidential veto. The damage done in the meantime might be irreparable. As I say, I want above everything else to have effective legislation that will work. I would like to be optimistic about what the final results are going to be. We have had this sort of scheme on our books for quite awhile and not a lot has happened. Yet I am still optimistic about it. At the same time, I cannot remove completely from my mind the responsibility that I believe is mine to try to see to it that there is a scintilla of safeguard of the independence for these great quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial agencies. Many of them are bipartisan.

Why is that? Because it is expected that in the administration of the basic law passed by the Congress, in which minority and majority combined, there will be expression of the minority viewpoint, whatever that may be, so far as that particular agency is concerned and to avoid political control. Of course, to transfer it to the executive branch of the Government would entirely do away with the whole concept of these independent agencies as that concept has developed through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Democratic and Republican members alike, has approached the consideration of this question from a very fine angle. There are only two differences of opinion, one expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the other by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

In relation to the observations made by the gentleman from Indiana, may I refresh the memory of my colleagues of the furor that developed in 1940 when the Civil Aeronautics Authority was put under the Commerce Department, though the board was expressly made independent of the Secretary. It was put in there for budgetary reasons. Instead of having that and a number of other agencies floating around and making up their own budgets, the Bureau of the Budget thought it advisable to put them in with certain other departments, yet maintain an independent status. Some Members of Congress honestly expressed the fear that the independence of the CAA would be taken away, that politics would enter into the matter, that planes would crash on account of lack of safety rules, that

the pilots would operate the planes through the skies in a negligent manner. Yet none of that has happened. The independence of the agency still exists. It is in the Department of Commerce for budgetary purposes and mainly for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, in that transfer the Congress had already effected a separation of the administrative functions from the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial function, and the only part of the operation that was transferred to the Commerce Department was the Office of the Administrator which did include the executive functions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is true, but you remember back 8 years ago the fears that were expressed as to the effect, and they have not materialized.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman indulge me in one further observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I have talked to some of the folks who are running that branch of the Government, and they are not quite sure whether the Secretary of Commerce is running it or the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, so I do not know what we finally accomplished as a result of it. Maybe we just put a few more people on, but I am not quarreling with the essential fact the gentleman has stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, we have 1,800 agencies in the Federal Government; most of them executive, one distinctly legislative—the General Accounting Office. Then we have these independent agencies.

Former President Hoover made an able presentation, and both he and President Truman are in agreement in relation to this bill; as a matter of fact, they both felt there should not be any exceptions at all or, rather, even any exceptions in the nature of a separate reorganization plan. President Hoover—and he speaks with the voice of experience—has testified that there are over 30 agencies engaged in lending money and making guaranties and in insurance activities. There are 23 activities engaged in major construction work competing against each other for labor and material. They are scattered over 11 departments of the Government. There are 10 agencies dealing with major transportation questions; that is, not connected with regulatory functions, that are scattered through 8 departments and independent agencies. There is the question of the agencies reporting to the President. He had three lists before him. One list showed 65 such agencies. Another computed 94 such agencies. Another computed them as 101 agencies reporting to the President. As the former President said, "The discrepancy in the lists is a difference of opinion as to how much responsibility the President may have in each case. Most of them exercise some executive function." The gentleman from Indiana presents a very interesting question and I am very glad he did. I have some observations to make which, I think that, as realists and legislators, we

cannot escape considering. We must face the realization of what has developed in the growth of so-called administrative law. At the outset of our country we were an agricultural nation. While the framers of the Constitution, as well as the later Congresses amending the Constitution, recognized the necessity of constitutional flexibility to meet changing conditions, particularly in the powers delegated to the Central Government under the general welfare clause, and the power to regulate interstate commerce, it is quite probable that they never contemplated the growth of our country into the great industrial Nation it is today. In order to try and meet the perplexing and trying problems arising from our intense economic system, which is a combination of our industry and agriculture, Congress, through necessity to try and meet the complicated situation, brought into being, which is now highly developed and will undoubtedly increase as necessity demands, a system through the establishment of many agencies, most of them independent, with quasi legislative power, authorizing them to enter into the field of detailed regulatory legislation as well as delegating to them quasi judicial powers to function effectively in carrying out the intent of the Congress. Congress resorted to the device of establishing independent agencies in the executive departments. That is where they are located. The Interstate Commerce Commission was the first instance, but the increase since its establishment has been rapid. The legislation that created them usually consisted of a declaration of the policy of the Congress, the promulgation of broad rules to govern the acts of individuals and corporations in a particular field, and a commission established with the authority to implement and enforce the policies and principles stated by the Congress. The theory is that the Congress did not advocate or even delegate its legislative functions, but it exercised that function of broad, general declarations leaving the application of its policy in a particular instance to an agency of its own creation.

The rules and regulations can only be set aside by an act of Congress or by decisions of the court, if any rule in the latter case goes beyond the authority granted to the agency. Until such action takes place, they have the force of law.

Such agencies have broad quasi-judicial powers in their given fields, with a limited review by the courts. Such agencies were born of the necessity that faced the Congress in meeting the important public questions, the recognition from a practical angle by the Congress of its inability to pass detailed regulatory legislation and also conduct necessary quasi-judicial hearings. That question of necessity arose in accomplishing its legislative purpose and objective.

But these agencies also have functions that are purely executive. In addition, the heads or members of the boards or commissions are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the same as strictly executive agencies. Their executive functions have increased tremendously. No matter what the intent of the Congress was in their crea-

tion, that they were intended as arms of the legislative branch, the very necessities of the operations of these agencies, the ever-growing questions that arise in their field, the large increase in the number of employees as a result thereof, and the many other demands made upon them, have brought about a sharp change in the character of these agencies and their operations and the original intent of the Congress in creating them.

Confining myself to the question of this bill, which is a reorganization bill, we must face the practical situation. There is no reason why these agencies should not be the subject of reorganization consideration. The very growth of their jurisdiction and duties, they being not responsible directly to the people, really makes them a fourth department of the Government. That is what they constitute. That is what it has developed into. We never intended that, but they have really developed into a fourth department of the Government. As they are now constituted, this raises some very serious questions as to whether the Congress should continue to consider them as arms of Congress or parts of the executive branch.

This question is not directly involved in this bill, but the fact does remain that if we exclude them or provide for a separate reorganization in so many agencies, we are not facing the realities of the situation. To provide in the case of every agency that a separate reorganization plan must be submitted by the President would seriously cripple the effectiveness of any reorganization of the executive branch. There are too many such agencies in existence.

I will admit that if I had my way we would not have made the exemptions we did, but this bill is the best bill that has ever been reported out of any committee. The first reorganization bill not so many years ago had 21 exemptions. The next one had 12 or 14 exemptions. In this bill there are no exemptions. We only provide that in the case of three agencies and one department a separate reorganization plan shall be submitted to the Congress.

These independent agencies have developed for all practical purposes into a fourth department of the Government, and the very serious implications arising therefrom cannot be overlooked by you and me as legislators. They cross the lines of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. They include all of the jurisdiction of the legislative, executive and judicial branches which were expressly established by the Constitution. Congress, through necessity, created them. We know, as experienced legislators, that Congress cannot, through necessity, successfully reorganize them. The very fact that we are considering this bill and the fact that Congress has in the past enacted into law reorganization bills is a frank admission of the inability of Congress to effectively reorganize the executive branch of the government, not to mention the so-called independent agencies. The many complicated questions involved make that very difficult from a practical angle. I think we have the courage. There is no question about it. But just think of the

vast scope of the executive branch of the government and think of these independent agencies and how they are interrelated. That is a very delicate and technical subject which Congress, from a practical angle, finds it difficult to approach. I cannot conceive of any President in reorganizing the independent agencies doing so in a manner which would affect the intent of Congress insofar as quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions are concerned, so that such agencies retain either an independent or an autonomous position—either independent as now, or autonomous within some other agency or department. Furthermore, we possess under this bill the right to refuse to approve any reorganization plans submitted to us. The gentleman from Indiana has done a very constructive piece of work in bringing this up. I make these observations for your consideration. Our independent agencies have gone far beyond the intent of Congress. They constitute, in fact, a fourth department of government. We will not reorganize them. This is the only way it can be done, by conferring upon the President the power. That will bring them back under one responsible head at least and not take them further away from the people than either the President or you or me as Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote for this legislation as it was reported from the Committee on Expenditures, of which I am a member. Ever since I have been in Congress reorganization of the executive branch of our Government has been a subject of keen interest to me. With the Reorganization Act of 1939, and again in 1945, there has been no recommendations of magnitude which would lend toward more efficient and economical operation of the executive branch of our Government. As at the present time, there is a tremendous overlapping and duplication of the functions of many of the agencies and bureaus of our Government, I cite just a few: Lending Government funds, 29 agencies; acquisition on land, 24; wildlife preservation, 16; welfare matters, 28; gathering statistics, 65. Is there any wonder that there is a lack of efficiency and economy and overall direction with so many agencies dealing with the same subjects? If we are ever going to curtail the unnecessary expansion of our Government, we must start now to consolidate and abolish those bureaus and agencies which are not necessary to the service of our people.

I feel that the President should be given the authority at this time to make whatever recommendations that are necessary for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government with all agencies and bureaus coming within the scope of this plan. It would, however, exclude the General Accounting Office and the courts of the District of Columbia. I am in wholehearted



agreement with the testimony given before our committee by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren. I questioned him as follows:

Mr. Warren, I have been greatly impressed today with the sincerity and the earnestness of your presentation with regard to this legislation. I followed it through carefully and I believe it is your earnest feeling that, if this legislation is enacted, there will be greater efficiency in the departments of our Government, and also there should be a tremendous amount of economy.

Mr. WARREN. I certainly do think that, Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would like to say this—and I weigh my words when I say it: If this fails, then we might as well close up the shop for good regarding hopes of ever reducing the size of this Government or eliminating waste and extravagance and useless functions. I say that very sincerely. I think this is just about the last chance. It is almost the last chance I will have coming up here on it.

Mr. Warren is not alone speaking as Comptroller General but with the background as a Member of Congress for many years.

Mr. Hoover, appearing before the committee, made this remark:

This is a step in the right direction and a step which should and must be taken without delay.

I feel, with this authority granted to the President by the Congress, there should be no reason why he cannot carry out the recommendations set forth in his letter to Congress asking for this authority. Therefore, if proper recommendations are not made, there will be no question as to where the responsibility can be placed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to state that I deem it an honor and a privilege to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the chairmanship of that able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

I am in favor of a reorganization of Government agencies, and I hope this proposed legislation will provide the efficiency and economy that we think it will.

I recognize that there are no exemptions for any agencies in this proposed legislation, but I would be remiss in my duties if I did not point out to the Members of this House that I have received a great many letters and telegrams from my constituents urging that the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, be exempt from reorganization under this legislation.

Since George Washington's time the civil functions have been historically performed by this highly trained, non-political branch of the Army, on a non-partisan and very efficient basis. They have performed with great credit in peacetime the river and harbor work especially where it involves the big multiple-purpose projects, such as navigation, reclamation, power, flood control, and in my district, particularly, bounded by two of the Great Lakes—Erie and Ontario—containing the Niagara River, and many small harbors, they have been

of immeasurable assistance to the area. These peacetime duties have contributed greatly to the success of our war efforts in the last two great world wars.

I would hate to see the functions now performed by the corps transferred to some other Federal agency, which may have tremendous political influence by virtue of a Secretary having Cabinet status, and to have these duties performed on the basis of politics rather than of high professional competence.

I hope, however, that the proposed legislation, which provides that a reorganization plan providing for reorganization affecting the National Military Establishment will have to be submitted to Congress in a so-called "one package" plan, will afford this great corps the protection it so richly deserves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts who just left the well of the House upon the acceptance by the now majority of the proposition offered by Mr. Hoover so many years ago, and upon their final belated recognition of his great services to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House is to support this resolution and I do commend it to the House. I think it should pass. I say I support this resolution—I am supporting the principle of the resolution. It was my own experience at the State level to serve in the capacity of attempting to help reorganize the State government. The general assembly made two or three rather futile attempts and finally passed a bill which in effect delegated that authority to the budget committee, of which I happened to be chairman at that time. I know the blood, sweat, and tears that came out of that particular type of effort. I say that this effort which is now before us is certainly a most laudable one because in comparison the need for reorganization at the Federal level is far, far greater than any that might be in existence at the State level.

For the last 20 years we have needed this. There have been a number of attempts made to reorganize the executive, most of which have achieved little general benefit, not only so far as the people are concerned but the efficiency of those who are empowered within the Government itself.

The Congress has not accomplished this very necessary task, and evidently will not. The present plan seems to be the very best hope to do so. While it does not provide the usual approach for the enactment of legislation, in that the President inaugurates the resolution and the Congress either votes it up or down, nevertheless the plan has already been used. There remains some doubt in the minds of Members of the House, particularly those who are constitutional lawyers, as to the constitutionality of this act. Not being an attorney, I am not attempting to pass on it. I do say, however, that the positive approach would seem the most logical one, but in the event that it is not adopted, certainly

I can say that this approach does provide all the necessary safeguards it would seem to me. For the final power is invested in the representatives of the people.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, who I think has made a very valiant attempt to try to get a good resolution before the House. This has not been an easy task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say I am very happy the gentleman from Indiana is a member of this committee because of the long years of experience he has had with this kind of problem. There is no limitation on the number of Government employees who can be employed at any particular time in this bill, is there? There is no provision at all to limit Federal employees?

Mr. HARVEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think that is one of the greatest weaknesses of the bill? Does not the gentleman feel that there should be a limitation placed in this resolution or in some bill which would provide that no more than so many Federal employees could be on the pay roll at any one time? I am afraid that this legislation will permit them to shift employees from one department, agency, or bureau of the Government to another, and we will get no reduction in the administrative personnel cost to the Government.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. And I wish to say that his point is well taken. However, due to his long experience in the field of appropriations, I would suggest to him that primarily the responsibility for reducing Government employees should be resolved in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman is right, except that I think that sort of thing could be placed in this bill. I wish to say to the gentleman that the subcommittee on the Interior Department in the Appropriations Committee, of which I was chairman last year, limited the amount of funds which could be spent by the Bureau of Reclamation to \$48,000,000.

Mr. HARVEY. May I congratulate the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. I may say that Mr. Lindsay Warren, our present Comptroller General, who testified before our committee and who was a Member of the Congress during the time when the 1939 act was placed on the books, said that it was defeated by the great army of "butter"; that everybody who came and testified before the committee said, "We are for this legislation, but," and then proceeded to ask for the exemption of some particular department. By the time the bill was through the Congress, two-thirds of those affected by the bill had sneaked out from under, so that when you start making exemptions in a

bill of this nature you will nullify its benefits.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that it is impossible to write a specific limitation into a bill, in view of the fact that government is not static; it is dynamic and a constantly changing function of service to the people, and by the very fact that Congress itself creates new services and new functions, it would be impossible to prescribe a definite limitation of personnel?

Mr. HARVEY. I might say to the gentleman that it was perhaps best described by the gentleman from Illinois as a fluid condition.

I shall conclude briefly by saying that I feel that the responsibility under this act will be placed directly on the President. I hope he will meet the obligation under the privilege we are giving him with no strings attached to it, and that he will perform this much-needed task for the improvement, efficiency, and economy of our Government.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill I wish to do so under three headings: First, the necessity for reorganization; second, the plan or method of reorganization; and, third, to touch briefly on the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. Under the latter head I need not take very much of the time of the Committee because I believe it is rather late to be raising the question of the right of Congress to delegate legislative authority. We have been doing it for the past hundred years, and so long as we set up proper standards to guide the person to whom the delegation of authority is made it is constitutional.

I am extending in the RECORD at this point a detailed argument for the constitutionality of this bill.

#### CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE REORGANIZATION BILL

Some question was raised at the hearings on H. R. 1569—Eighty-first Congress—as to the constitutionality of turning over to the Executive the legislative function involved in reorganization of the executive branch. The bill proposes authority to transfer, consolidate, or abolish agencies and/or functions of the Federal establishment, the President's orders or plans for such purpose to become effective only after they have lain before Congress in session for 60 days without the adoption by the two Houses of a concurrent resolution of disapproval.

From one point of view there is no delegation at all. That is, as suggested at the hearings, there is merely a reversal of the legislative process, the Executive acting first, and the Congress completing the legislative action by declining to negate the propositions. This is not, however, tenable, because the legislative process requires—Constitution, article I, section 7, clause 2—that both Houses concur separately on each enactment; under the plan of the present bill a reorganization plan will become law notwithstanding one House may vote its outright disapproval.

Rather, it seems more in order to regard the plans as legislation by the Executive, under authority delegated in the present bill, subject, as a safeguard, to veto if both Houses disapprove during the 60-day waiting period. Is such delegation authorized?

It is far too late to raise a question whether the legislative function may be delegated. What was sanctioned by over a hundred years of decisions—*The Brig Aurora* (7 Cr. 382 (1813)), *Field v. Clark* (143 U. S. 649 (1892)), *Intermountain Rate cases* (234 U. S. 476 (1914))—of the Supreme Court was not intended to be overturned by the two decisions in the NRA cases 14 years ago—*Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), *Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States* (295 U. S. 495). The latter gave direction, but did not call a halt. That this, on reflection, is obvious, is demonstrated by the more recent delegations of legislative power now fully sustained on topics and subjects far more essentially legislative in their nature and incidence, for example, devaluation of the dollar, tariff adjustments by reciprocal trade agreements, price fixing by OPA, rent control, as still in effect, and many others—*Yakus v. U. S.* (321 U. S. 414, 64 S. Ct. 660), *Bowles v. Willingham* (321 U. S. 503, 64 S. Ct. 641). What was given point by the NRA cases was the requirement that Congress fulfill its function by delineating the policies to be followed, demarking the guides for Executive action, and detailing the standards which the President must follow. It is believed the first five sections of the bill comply with these requirements admirably. They set forth the aims to be sought, the methods to be used, the objectives to be reached to effect the aims, and the limits and restraints which may not be encroached upon. Thus while it has been objected that the bill proposes to abdicate the legislative power of the House to the President and to the Senate—since the joint approval of the latter could effectuate a plan turned down by the House—it seems more correct to say the House is now, by the adoption of this bill, exercising its constitutional function and giving force in advance to whatever plans of the Executive are promulgated under its authority—and, more importantly, pursuant to its provisions—and are not disapproved by the Senate.

Two authorities seem to be so closely in point as themselves to be determinative. While the concurrent resolution veto was called for by the 1939 and 1945 acts, no tests were possible under the former because Congress approved each plan affirmatively by what amounted to a new statute in each case—Fifth United States Code 133s-u-v—and no court cases on the question have been noted under the 1945 act.

But in two cases the constitutional issue was directly raised under the previous but quite similar Reorganization Act of March 3, 1933. It is notable that that act was much broader than the present bill, in that there were no exempt agencies or single-plan method called for. There was less detail in the way of guides and standards, and while the Executive orders were required to lay before Congress for 60 days, there

was no provision for a congressional veto other than by the enactment of new legislation. Certain sections of the Government-wide reorganization effected under that law—Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933—were questioned upon the basis that the delegation of authority was unwarranted under the Constitution. The case came up before a statutory three-judge court, composed of Circuit Judge Chase, District Judge Bondy, and District Judge Robert P. Patterson. The reorganization was fully sustained in the decision of the court, the opinion stating, Congress "elected to have the President investigate and decide what should be done in this regard in the furtherance of efficiency and economy and then adopted his decision. The result was to abolish a board whose existence was dependent upon the will of Congress and to delegate to the Department of Commerce the same powers and duties the board had possessed. This seems in accord with correct standards as to delegation of authority to act within proper limits prescribed by Congress"—*Isbrandtsen-Moller Co., Inc. v. United States et al.* (14 F. Supp. 407 (1936)).

That opinion was adopted and given full approval by a similar three-judge court in the District of Columbia, composed of Appeals Justice Groner, District Judge Wheat, and District Judge Proctor, in *Swayne & Hoyt v. United States* (18 F. Supp. 25).

While the two cases were later affirmed in the Supreme Court, the decisions did not turn on this issue because in the meantime Congress had given express sanction to the reorganization by means of later legislation. However, in one subsequent case the Supreme Court referred with apparent approval to the method of reorganization contained in the 1939 act with its provisions, as here, for the plans to become effective unless a concurrent resolution disapprove them—*Sibbach v. Wilson & Co.* (312 U. S. 1, 15 (1941)).

Also, it is worth while to be noted that the method of reorganization proposed by the present bill to be readopted has been fully approved by the commentators on this subject. See, for example, a symposium on Federal executive reorganization in volume 40, *American Political Science Review*, at page 1152, and the article entitled "The Legislative Veto and the Reorganization Act of 1939," by Millett and Rogers in volume 1, *Public Administration Review*, No. 176, 1941. It is suggested also, as a most significant and persuasive authority, that the Congress itself has already fully examined the constitutionality of this identical procedure, and after extended debate has approved and adopted it. See *seriatim*, the debates in the House and the Senate on the 1945 Reorganization Act.

As to the necessity for the legislation it seems that it is hardly necessary that I say very much. We are all, I believe, agreed that there ought to be reorganization in principle, as somebody said before our committee; and then somebody suggested that we must in this case rise above principle and exempt certain agencies. We all agree in principle that there



should be reorganization; the trouble is that every agency of the Government wants to be exempted. Reorganization is needed not only for efficiency and economy but that we may give to the Executive some real power. He has a responsibility to execute the laws of the land, but we have so hedged him about that it is sometimes very difficult for him to do so. I saw the statement credited to him in the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that it had gotten to the point where he had to kiss some of these officials on both cheeks before he could get them to do what was their plain duty; kissing them on one cheek was not enough. I am sure some of you have had the experience that I have, that you almost feel you have got to kiss some other portion of their anatomy to get any consideration. This situation demands correction.

As to the necessity for economy in government, I was struck by what Mr. Hoover said in his testimony. Somebody asked him about taxation and the raising of more revenue for the Government. He said that we had reached the saturation point in taxation; and I am inclined to agree with him. We cannot cut down our appropriations for national defense. We are embarking, or we say we are going to embark, upon a program of additional service to the people which will cost money. There is but one place left, then, where we can economize, and that is in the actual operation of the machinery of our Government, and here is a chance for us to do it not only in principle but actually. How shall it be done? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] proposes that instead of doing it this way we do it some other way. Everyone agrees that for the past 150 years it has been impossible or impractical for the Congress itself to do this reorganizing job. We have not done it and there is nothing to indicate that we are in any better condition to do it now than we were then. The gentleman from Michigan says that we are overturning our constitutional procedure, and I have great respect for the gentleman's views on the constitutionality of this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's judgment. Will he tell us why in his opinion the Congress has not done it?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, I will tell the gentleman why. It is because, as Mr. Lindsay Warren said, of the ganging up process.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman and we have been complacent enough to go along.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right. The departments have ganged up on us and we cannot do the job. I do not say the President will do it; however, I think he will try to do the job. He will certainly have no excuse if he does not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the primary object of the legislation before the House today is efficiency and economy in government and, goodness only knows, every Member of Congress realizes that that should take place.

There are two things about this legislation that I do not like. The first is that there is no termination date in this bill. It seems to me there ought to be a time limit. There should be 2 or 3 years within which to act and then we ought to stop, because we should not be subject to a President bringing in legislation whenever he wants to, regardless of who the President might be, when he thinks there ought to be a change in government. I have seen Presidents who wanted to change the Government a whole lot when I did not think it ought to be changed. Sometimes they get enough enthusiasm worked up for a particular thing that it goes through and after it is passed we are sorry it happened. Many of you have experienced those changes yourself.

I listened very intently to the testimony of Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, in which he made his recommendations. There is no one in Government I hold in higher respect than I do Lindsay Warren. He knows more about the operation of Government, in my opinion, than any living man, at least since I have been a Member of Congress. It is his job to study our Government. He has vision and he makes recommendations as he sees them for the best interest of Government economy and efficiency.

If you will turn to page 37 of the hearings you will see there the examples of overlapping and duplication which occur in Government in the following table:

Agencies	
Lending Government funds.....	29
Insuring deposits and loans.....	3
Acquisition of land.....	34
Wildlife preservation.....	16
Government construction.....	10
Credit and finance.....	9
Home and community planning.....	12
Welfare matters.....	28
Forestry matters.....	14
Examination of banks.....	4
Gathering statistics.....	65

When you think of 65 agencies of the Government sending out requests to the business people of this country asking for information, it is no wonder that the business people of the country are sick and tired of making out reports. It is time to stop it.

When we have all of these duplications in Government certainly there is need for consolidation, a need for efficiency. We want to get the operation of our Government down to the point where the affairs of Government are conducted without so much red tape, without so much cost. When you look back to 1932 you will find that it cost \$4,600,000,000 annually to run the Government, while today it is costing \$41,858,000,000. In other words, in 1932 the per capita cost of running our Government was \$37.49, while today the per capita cost has risen to \$282.82. The thing has just gone up by leaps and bounds. It is wrong. I tried to stop it but was unable to do so.

Do you know that in 1932, when we had a President who said, "I am going to consolidate the bureaus and eliminate waste in Government" that there were only about 300 agencies of Government, and now we have 1,800 agencies of Government. Why, the thing has grown in leaps and bounds. I will never forget that as long as I live, and I do not want to see it happen again. Then we had Mr. Hoover and his committee, and on that committee there was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Manssco, who were helping to make the recommendations that are going to go to the President of the United States. Now we have men of that caliber trying to make recommendations to the President, and he should bring something in here that will simplify Government. Of course, the President does not have to follow out the recommendations made by the Hoover Committee. But, I feel this way: The thing has gone so far we are headed for the rocks, and while this legislation is not the way I want to do it, I am willing to accept it, because I know it is about as good as you can get. If you get something that is about as good as you can get, and you think it is going to try to stop wrongs in Government, you better grab hold of that or else you are going to swamp or drown in Government red tape and confusion, and I am not ready to drown yet. So I will accept this as the best legislation you can get at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been an exceedingly fine experience to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the House of Representatives. It has been my good fortune to have had an opportunity to observe the operations of Congress here in the Capitol for 24 years; 16 years of this time from outside, from the gallery, and from around in the corridors as a secretary, and for 8 years or a little better as a Member of the House. I have watched the expansion of the Federal Government. I have watched what we call and what we term the bureaucrats and the "brass" coming in and taking charge, and looking over the tops of their glasses and telling the secretary from your office this, that, or the other, and then when they report and you go down they tell you this, that, or the other. So, why, Mr. Chairman, are they so untouchable? This Congress was created with, and this House and the other branch of the Congress are delegated with, power to carry out the public business. Every 2 years the Membership of this House and every 6 years the Membership in the other body are called on to give an account of their stewardship. The public, the voters if you please, are the check and balance of Congress. But here someone rises up and says, "Oh, you must not touch this agency; you must not touch that agency." They are sort of holy affairs. They are created for a special and

a specific purpose. They are delegated to do this, that, or the other. Well, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that any agency, any private business, any Government, or any other functions should run without a balance wheel and in this legislation we propose to add the balance wheel to the Government. We propose in this legislation to set forth a form by which they should be audited and checked and made to come in and give an account of themselves, and if they are found superfluous, then to be amalgamated with some other agency so that the machinery can go on in a better fashion and not require so much oiling. In the bill we have under consideration there are only three controversial matters.

Since I have become a member of the committee I have spent quite a bit of time reading the debates on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back through the years. I recall the debate in 1939 when this floor was packed and jammed, when the galleries were packed and jammed, and when the corridors were full. The able gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] participated in the debate, which went on for days and days. The former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], participated in the debate. The present Speaker of the House participated in the debate. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was a great participant, as was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

It is very noticeable and apparent here today that this question has been debated so much, and every one of the three phases that are in controversy here today have been discussed so much that the seasoned Members of this House and the country as a whole have come to the conclusion that there is nothing further to say about the matter and that further debate is unnecessary; that this Congress should go forward with a program similar to this program, which is the best that can be had, this program which has been thrashed out by the committee, the Members on both sides agreeing to present the matter to the floor of the House, reserving in the legislation that we are passing today a part of the responsibility in reorganizing the Government. The part is that in effecting the law we reserve the right here in the House to say whether it shall be done or shall not be done as proposed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. Chairman, I would not enter into debate with any constitutional lawyer here on the floor of this House, but it has been interesting to me to read about the constitutional question which was debated in 1939, in 1945, and in other years. I think some of the gentlemen on the floor here today participated in those debates. I believe those who participated in the debate in 1939 and those who read that debate will agree that the provision laid down in this proposed legislation, reserving the right in this body to say whether the proposal shall be in effect, is not the constitutional question. The constitutional question is taken care of in the law we propose to pass here today, and it has so been discussed in connection with the act of 1939 and other

acts, and evidently by the large favorable vote sustained.

I think it is beyond a question of doubt that with the passage of this bill we will have an opportunity to reject or accept such proposals as will come to the Congress. Whether they are money saving or not is not the question. The question is whether the Government will function better under the proposals as sent down or as the Government is functioning today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration, according to its sponsors, is to give authority to the President for reorganization of executive agencies, and, further, according to the sponsors of this bill, it is hoped that by reason thereof the executive department may run more efficiently and with more economy.

It is at least interesting to observe that the duplication and multiplication of effort, as well as waste and extravagance, have come about largely through administrative practices, and because agencies that have been created have taken power and authority under themselves that was never intended by Congress. So you are saying today that even though Congress did not intend to provide all of the duplication and multiplication of effort in the Government, it takes an act of Congress to correct it. Independent agencies have, of course, extended and expanded far beyond the intent of Congress.

Those of you who have served in Congress during recent years know that I have put forth a special effort to bring about more efficiency and less extravagance in the Government, and have tried to deal with the question of duplication and multiplication of effort that has spread itself far and wide throughout our agencies.

I submitted to this House on two occasions legislation to deal in a constructive manner with this problem. My legislation would have provided for an arm of Congress that would constantly study the problems we are discussing today and would make recommendations to Congress as to how and wherein the Government could be made to operate more efficiently and economically.

Examples of some of the overlapping and duplication of effort are set forth in the committee hearings in support of this legislation. For example, there are 29 agencies dealing with lending of Government funds. There were 34 agencies during the war dealing with acquisition of land. There are 16 agencies dealing with wildlife preservation, 10 with Government instructions. Home community planning seems to be a popular thing to do. We have 12 agencies dealing with that problem. There are 28 agencies that deal with welfare matters, and 14 agencies with forestry. There are 65 agencies gathering statistics. It is no wonder that people are confused.

I think one of the best authorities on this subject matter, and one who has given the problem a great deal of study, and one who has tried to deal with it realistically and in a practical manner,

is our Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren. Let me quote briefly some of the things he had to say, and you find his statements in the hearings:

This unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot hope to operate efficiently or to do well the job the taxpayers are paying for unless someone can assume the burden of putting like functions together, to make only one or two bureaus grow where dozens grew before. What is more, reorganizing is not just reshuffling; it is also abolishing agencies and functions. A tree expected to grow must be carefully pruned, for new branches to have life we must cut off those no longer bearing fruit.

Let me quote further from his statements:

I reiterate that the present set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the tax eaters, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill.

Ex-President Hoover has been quoted many times on both sides of the aisle today. It is rather interesting that President Hoover, after 16 or 18 years out of Government, should be called upon to assist in dealing with this question. Of course, I am in favor of legislation that will bring about more economy, more efficiency, and less waste and extravagance in our Government. Whether the enactment of this proposed legislation will do the job is yet to be determined.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a minute, if I have time. The distinguished gentleman from California who is now on his feet was a member of the House Committee on Civil Service and is presently a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He is one of the active working members of that committee and gives of his time and energy in the study of the problems that come before that committee. He will recall I submitted legislation, the intent and purpose of which was to deal with this problem in a constructive and effective manner. I believe if that proposed legislation had been enacted into law, a great share of the waste, extravagance, and duplication and multiplication of effort to which the majority floor leader has called attention would not have been as big as it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce to the Republican Members that the conference which was to be held this afternoon following the session has been postponed until tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching and an important measure. Far be it from me to intimate that something should not be done about this situation in which we find ourselves. We



all seem to be agreed and nobody would dispute the proposition that we do have too many agencies. Many of them are overlapping. Many of them are pyramided, one above the other. There are many duties and functions of government that are duplicated, that are performed by people whose services are not necessary. However, it occurs to me—and I say this with all due deference to the gentlemen who have studied this matter and have spent days in its consideration—that you and I have just been handed this measure upon the spur of the moment. I would like to have had time to read this proposal and the hearings, but this proposal and the hearings were not available until today. It is a reversal of the traditional methods of legislation. Ordinarily, when an end is to be accomplished by the enactment of law, the law is written before it is submitted to the House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. No; not now. I am seeking the light and I am afraid when the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not say that applies to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, there is nothing personal about this. I am just being impersonal and making an observation which, if my good friend will take to heart and meditate upon it, it may be a salutary thing for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always listen to my friend with a great deal of interest.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate the fact you do, and I always listen with interest and profit to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JENNINGS. I could not refuse to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend probably did not know it, but a copy of the hearings and a copy of the bill now before us, together with the report of the committee, was sent to every Member of the House so that they were received last Saturday.

Mr. JENNINGS. Well, I did not get it. I do not know whether it came to my office or not. I am not angry. I am not laboring under any sense of having been disregarded or neglected. I know that the gentlemen involved are all my friends, but I am just talking about the magnitude of this task and the magnitude of this proposal.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now my friend will be gracious enough to yield to me, will he not?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to yield the gentleman one additional minute to talk on the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Perhaps the gentleman from California and I should have a private conversation on this question.

All I am undertaking to say is that it is proposed to delegate to the President these vast powers, yet everybody here

knows that the President will not have a thing in the world to do with it; somebody else will work it out. I do not know who will write this proposed reorganization plan affecting all these agencies. I am saying that when a measure is brought in embodying such far-reaching effects that it should spell out, within its pages, exactly what is being provided. I cannot see why this is not done. If you have not had time to write a measure, if you have not had time to abolish agencies, if you have not had time to consolidate their powers or abolish their powers, now is a good time for you to do it and bring in a bill so clear and specific that we will know exactly what we are voting on. We will know exactly who is going to carry out the proposed measure. We all know the President is not going to do this thing personally; he will simply give it his sanction when those to whom he delegates the power we delegate to him have written their report; when they have written the law we alone should write. It looks to me as though this is a delegation of power upon a delegation. You are inaugurating a new system of multiplication, overlapping, duplication, and pyramiding here when you adopt this proposal. You delegate to the President the power to redelegate that power to someone whose identity you do not know and may never know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure many of you know, I am one of the two Members of the House who, under the provisions of H. R. 775, the law which created the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, represent this body on that important Commission. The Commission, just to review for one moment, is a bipartisan commission. It is made up of 12 members, 6 from public life and 6 from private life. Four members were named by the Speaker of the House, one Democrat and one Republican being Members of the House and one Democrat and one Republican being private citizens; four were named by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life, on a bipartisan basis; four were appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life. The Commission has been meeting for approximately 18 months on a night and day schedule. We have used some 28 task forces in the work of studying the possibilities for helpful reorganization in the executive branch of the Government. These task forces were named on a non-partisan basis. Some three hundred outstanding citizens of America have contributed their time and their efforts as leaders of these task forces, or as members of the special committees and special commissions that have been set up to study some particular problem of government—some function, some activity, or perhaps, in some cases, some

single department or agency of the Government.

I am very happy and very proud to be able to say to the House today that never once in all of the meetings of the Commission, nor in all of the various considerations given to the work of this Commission by the task forces, has there ever been a division along party lines or between the civil members, the private citizens, on the one hand, and the so-called official group on the other. If there has ever been an honest effort made to do a job for the benefit of all the people of America, it has been done by your Commission under the able and splendid leadership of the only living ex-President of the United States. I am also proud to say that the President of the United States, the occupant of the White House at the present time, has aided materially in many, many ways the work of this Commission. The heads of the various departments of government in the executive branch have also cooperated. So I can assure you I approach this legislation entirely from a nonpartisan angle.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be enacted into law. I may say, and I have to say this to you in all honesty, that when the question of requesting of Congress the enactment of a reorganization act came before the Commission I had some reticence in my own mind as to just how we should approach the problem, and as to just what sort of reorganization act we should adopt. Yet I became firmly convinced, as we considered the matter, that if we want to accomplish the great purposes for which the Commission was created by the Congress by unanimous vote—and approved by the President promptly—we must give some single authority, to wit, the President of the United States, the power to put most of the Commission's reorganization plans into effect. I was rather concerned about the section of the proposed bill which seemingly sets aside the old well-established constitutional procedure, or at least my understanding of it, whereby it is the legislative branch which legislates, and the President or Chief Executive who acts as the braking power or the controlling power to veto any measure which the Congress may pass, so that Congress must reconsider its position before taking final legislative action.

This provision in this bill, which sets up the requirement whereby each branch of Congress must veto or vote down in any reorganization plan the President may submit, did give me serious concern. Yet I was willing to accept it. Finally I agreed, in the Commission, to accept that section providing we had one other safeguard in the bill. We do have the understanding in the Commission, by the way, that any of us may dissent on any matter, be free to express our own opinion. As I stated, I am willing to accept the section requiring both Houses of Congress to vote down a reorganization plan providing we would have this one safeguard—that there be no permanent authority granted to the President or to his high office to reorganize the Government anytime he wants and in any way he wants.

I am truly sorry that I cannot agree with some of my colleagues on the Commission and with some of my colleagues in the House in support of the provision for a permanent power to be placed in the hands of the President to reorganize the Government. In fact, I think if a time limitation were put on his power to reorganize, if we set a date by which action must be taken, the result will be that the Chief Executive will more rapidly put into effect the recommendations this Commission may make.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman probably knows more about this problem than most anyone in the House. Is this a correct analysis of it: That what we are doing is not delegating legislative power; we are merely giving wider administrative power, including the power to unite and eliminate agencies, and so forth, to make for better administration, and we are merely reserving the right to negative that administrative action by legislation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I do not want to go that far with the gentleman. Under the Constitution, and under the law, the President of the United States, regardless of what we may do, does have a great deal of power to put into effect a large part of the recommendations and the findings that the Commission will make from time to time to the Congress. But in other instances the President must have this legislative authority and power to make the program comprehensive, and to really do the job of reorganizing. In some instances under the Constitution and statutes already effective we will have to have legislative enactments to accomplish the purpose of the Commission.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a truer statement to say that we are not in this bill delegating reorganizing powers to the President; we are delegating to the President the authority to prepare a plan, as our agent, because he is in a better position than we to prepare a plan of reorganization, which then comes back to us, and we either disapprove it, or, by doing nothing, allow it to become the law and he can then issue orders carrying it out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think there is much to what the gentleman says. There is a very fine point involved. We are authorizing the President to make and submit certain reorganization plans subject to our possible disapproval. That is actually what the bill provides.

Mr. JUDD. Not to our disapproval of the actual orders given but to our disapproval of the plan. He cannot issue an order to carry out this reorganization until the 60 days have gone by without adverse action by us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. So that we do not veto a reorganization; we veto a plan which he has prepared as our agent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would be a plan of reorganization.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do want to say to the House that the great Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on which I had the honor and pleasure of serving in the last Congress, has, in my opinion, acted wisely and well in bringing this legislation to the floor. Certainly we cannot accomplish the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, for the purpose of bringing about greater efficiency and economy in its operation, unless reorganization powers, such as contained in the bill, are given to the President. However, there is one dangerous provision in the bill. I can readily accept all other provisions, as I said a moment ago, although I am not too happy about one or two of them. I certainly do not want to see established, as a pattern by which we will be guided in the future in our legislative meditations, either that Congress should act only as an agency to veto actions of the President or that he be given permanent authority to reorganize the Government. Rather than lose the great good that can come from this reorganization, I am willing to accept this bill, if necessary, but I do think we should keep the power in our own hands over the organization of the executive branch of the Government by placing a limit upon the length of time the President can exercise the great power this measure confers. I do not know who may be President 10, 20, or 30 years from now. As much as I respect the President and the Presidency, I would rather always trust the future of the country to the people's representatives in the Congress than to any one individual who may rise to power as President of the United States in the future.

What I say here today is not a reflection on the gentleman who now occupies the White House, as I am sure, from conversations and from the interviews we have had as a commission with him, that he is just as much interested in seeing these reforms go into effect as the Commission which has worked upon them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is of course making a most valuable statement. I, who have served with him on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for the last 2 years, know the valuable service he has rendered on that committee and also on the Hoover Commission, on which he is now serving.

In regard to the limitation of the time, I think the gentleman certainly makes a point there. However, I would ask him if it would not be possible that the Congress by affirmative action at any

time could place such a limitation of time upon this program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I agree with the gentleman, but that is a dangerous method to pursue, I am afraid, because we can grant a power to the Chief Executive by a simple majority vote of this Congress, but, under our constitutional processes, if a President does not wish to surrender a power, we cannot take that power away from him by legislative action unless we have a two-thirds majority. That is the one great danger I see in the present bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Moreover, we have been assured by the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the committee, that the President could bring about these reorganizations not within 2 years but within a few months, so why extend it indefinitely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know whether he can do it all in just a relatively few months. I think we have to give him a couple of years, at least, to be fair. However, I do believe that the placing of a time limitation on his authority will act as a spur or a prod to get prompt action—so that there will not be any delay—whereas if the President is given permanent power it may be said, "Oh, there is plenty of time to do that." It is a human failing to put things off, and this governmental reorganization should not be put off. The people of America want action quickly, and I think the President wants action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his very, very valuable contribution to this matter. It comes from long experience. We know that his interest in this subject matter is great, and we know of his work with the committee.

I said that we would expect some form of reorganization action upon the different phases as they were presented to us within a few months, but not on the entire reorganization plan, which must necessarily spread over the years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say in answer to the gentleman that the Commission will file its reports soon. I believe the first report was filed today at noon. That was our schedule. Other reports will be filed every 2 or 3 or 4 days between now and March 13. Of course, the President cannot possibly get all of these matters before him before that time. It will take many months for him to act, but, in my opinion, he should not have permanent power to reorganize, because we want quick action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote in support of the reorganization bill, H. R. 2361, but I am going to do so with full knowledge of the fact that we are passing on to our President a job that Congress has repeatedly tried to do and failed.



I am supporting the measure because I think the recommendation of the committee ought to be carried out in the interest of economy and better service.

The only thing that gives me concern in the enactment of this bill is the knowledge that no matter what kind of reorganization measure the President may propose he is sure to be condemned by part of the people on the ground that it does not go far enough and by everybody else on the ground that it goes too far. In other words, whatever measures are offered will lead only to criticism.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 15 years I have been connected with the Executive Expenditures Committee in one capacity or another. During that period I have seen many reorganization proposals, but in my opinion the bill we have before us today is the best reorganization legislation that has ever been presented to the House.

In the strict sense of the word, this bill is not in itself a reorganization bill. Rather, it is the mechanical device with which a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government can be accomplished. The bill sets up a simplified method for revising the organization of the Government through the cooperation of the President and the Congress. The legislation authorizes the President to submit to the Congress plans for reorganizations of agencies and functions of the executive branch. These plans will become effective after 60 days unless they are rejected by a majority vote of the two Houses. In adopting this legislation we reserve to the Congress the right to veto any proposed reorganization plan with which we may not agree. The advantage of this mechanical device is that it enables the President, who has the immediate responsibility for effective administration, to initiate improvement in organization, subject to the review and rejection by Congress. The passage of this bill is the first step that must be taken to bring about any reorganization of the 1,800 offices, bureaus, commissions, administrations, and departments, which make up our Government today.

A year and a half ago the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported a resolution to the House providing for the establishment of a Commission To Study the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with the view of recommending improvements. This resolution was passed unanimously. The Commission was set up and chose as its Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover. It is composed of two Representatives of the Congress, two Members of the other body, two administrators of the executive branch, and six private citizens. The Commission has made an extensive study of the administration of the Government and within the coming weeks will submit many recommendations for improving the Federal structure. The committee had the privilege of hearing Mr. Hoover and he pointed out that passage of this bill is absolutely neces-

sary if we are to bring about a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. His testimony made clear that many of the most important recommendations of this Commission can be accomplished only if Congress adopts legislation as provided in this bill.

I believe all of us will agree that keeping the executive branch of the Government in good order is a continuing operation. Reorganization of the Government is not a one-time undertaking. Almost every administration for the past hundred years has urged Federal reorganization but none has brought any major overhaul of the executive agencies.

At the present time agencies of related objectives are scattered all over the Government. There are many Government offices duplicating the same type of work as other agencies. Perhaps not all of such activities can be concentrated in one agency, but we can certainly improve the existing governmental structure.

Practically all of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee felt that this bill should be passed. Of course, we have had the same requests for exemptions that have heretofore been made in connection with legislation of this character. In writing this bill, however, we made no exemptions. The history of this type of legislation shows that where one exemption is made that exemption becomes the basis for others. To make all of the exemptions that would ordinarily be requested in connection with a bill of this kind would destroy its effectiveness. Instead of a bill to facilitate governmental reorganization, we would simply wind up with a bill of exemptions.

In writing this bill, however, we have recognized the desirability of adopting the single reorganization plan method insofar as the National Military Establishment is concerned as well as the major quasi-judicial agencies. The bill does not exempt these agencies from reorganization, but simply provides that any plan for their reorganization must be submitted singly rather than in a general proposal that might affect other Government offices. In this way, Congress will have the opportunity to vote separately on the controversial fields of Federal reorganization.

Suppose, for example, that the Corps of Engineers of the Army is involved in a reorganization plan. That plan can relate only to the National Military Establishment, of which the Engineers is a part. It cannot be tied in with a plan to reorganize some other Government agency. This will certainly assure adequate protection for the so-called controversial agencies.

I do not want to engage in a constitutional discussion, but in my opinion this bill certainly creates no dictatorial powers. In proposing that the President take the initiative and originate plans for the redistribution of executive agencies, Congress reserves a veto power over such plans that he may submit. As you know, the President also has the power of veto. This idea is not a new one. It was first recommended in 1931

by former President Hoover and it has been passed in this House in several reorganization bills since 1939. It is true that the constitutional authority to legislate is vested in the Congress, but this bill does not in any way divest Congress of its legislative prerogative. The bill contains no ban nor limitation on the Congress or its right to legislate. Rather than a limitation, this legislation is an implementation of the legislative prerogative of the Congress.

I hope that the House will adopt this bill and that it will be passed without adding a lot of exemptions. We have the opportunity now to make a major contribution in bringing about greater efficiency in the operation of our governmental offices and departments. It is our responsibility to see that these departments and agencies are as efficient as they can be made, which in turn will be reflected economy and savings to the people we represent.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this measure, the Reorganization Act of 1949, and to go on record as saying that I am in full accord with its objectives and provisions. The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has submitted this bill to the House and recommended its passage only after extensive hearings, careful study, and deliberation, and I am convinced that it offers a workable method of executive-legislative cooperation for making changes in the Federal administrative organization to promote efficiency and economy in Government.

This is a simple bill—it contains no bugs or hidden jokers—its provisions can easily be understood by everyone. The purposes of this bill now under consideration are to reduce expenditures and promote economy in Government—to provide better service to the American people at less cost to the American taxpayer. This end is to be achieved through the regrouping and consolidation of agencies and functions into a more orderly and integrated administrative organization, and in this way eliminate the overlapping of functions and duplication of effort in our Government.

The procedure established by this bill to bring about a reorganization of the administration is simple and workable—it merely provides that the President shall examine the administrative set-up from time to time from the viewpoint of obtaining more efficient and economical execution of Federal policy, and present recommendations for any adjustments in the form of reorganization plans for the consideration of Congress. Such plans shall go into effect after 60 legislative days unless Congress, through concurrent resolution passed by both Houses, rejects said plan. In other words, the President initiates plans for reorganization, and the Congress reviews, ratifies, or rejects such plans. This is a democratic procedure to which there should be no objections.

The need for a general overhauling of our administration has been recognized

by every President since Theodore Roosevelt, and by every responsible student of government. Today the Federal administration is a great sprawling labyrinth of agencies—there are over 1,800 of these bureaus, departments, commissions, divisions, administrations, and offices which have accumulated by legislative and executive actions throughout the years. Within this maze of agencies there is considerable overlapping of functions, conflicts of jurisdiction, competition between different agencies, waste, and working at cross-purposes. As a result of this multiplicity and overlap of agencies, there is a great deal of red tape, confusion, and inefficiency.

Now, I am not blaming anyone for this condition. The fact is that our huge administrative mechanism has, as a result of the needs of the people for new services and the demand of two world wars, been built up without plan or design, like the barns, shacks, silos, toolsheds, and garages of an old farm, to become a veritable jungle of unrelated units and services. As a result the President cannot properly execute the laws for which he is held responsible—he is forced to waste his time dealing with some 45 to 80 agencies which report directly to him, and which prevent him from concentrating on the more important duties of his office.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is obligated to take action to remedy this disorganized state of affairs, and the path to follow has been well defined. As the result of research, investigation, and practical experience in business and government, certain well-established principles of organization have developed, and are now generally accepted as the fundamentals of sound public administration. These guiding principles said to be basic in the reorganization of government may be summarized as follows:

First. The functions of government should be grouped into a few orderly departments, with each department being responsible for carrying out all related functions contributing to one major objective;

Second. Each major department should be headed by an administrator appointed by and responsible to the President, thus giving the Chief Executive power to effectively control and direct the administration;

Third. The President should not have more than 20 agency heads reporting to him directly, thus freeing him from the mass of administrative detail, and permitting him to devote his time to major questions of policy;

Fourth. The lines of authority within the departments should be clearly defined and direct from the upper to the lower levels of the administrative hierarchy; and

Fifth. Purely administrative functions should be separated from quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions, with the latter being placed under the jurisdiction of autonomous boards and commissions.

These are the standards of sound public administration, and the goals toward which we move in seeking more efficiency in government. This reor-

ganization bill is the first step—the enabling step—toward sound management in our Federal Government. I am sure that its passage will provide better service and more efficient management at less cost to the people of the United States, and I call upon the Congress to enact it into law.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, for a great many years the question of reorganizing the executive agencies of our Government has been a matter of concern, not only to the Congress but to every taxpayer. The subject is not new but the need for reorganization is continually getting more acute.

The number of executive agencies has increased with every Congress and their fields of activity have been expanded.

This situation has brought about many instances of overlapping jurisdictions and duplication of effort which have been accompanied by inefficiency, wastefulness, and ineffectiveness.

Everyone who has any contact with the Federal agencies recognizes the existence of the situation and sees an urgent need for better utilizing the manpower on the Federal pay roll.

The subject has been much discussed but few worthwhile results have been achieved. This is a problem of tremendous magnitude which the Eightieth Congress recognized. Two years ago we passed legislation which resulted in the establishment of the Commission headed by former President Hoover. That Commission has been at work for nearly 2 years making exhaustive studies of our governmental set-up and soon its reports will be submitted to us and to the President with recommendations for remedial action.

The bill before us today will provide a vehicle for the effectuation of recommendations based on the studies of the Hoover Commission. Without this legislation much of the value of the work the Commission has done will be lost.

During the hearings conducted before our committee, many people denounced the existing situation and spoke of "deadwood" in the executive agencies. It is significant, however, that many of the witnesses, while espousing the cause of reorganization, sought exemptions for specific agencies in which they or their constituents were personally interested. This brings into point the need for giving to the President the authority to make recommendations of corrections under legislation which will assure prompt and positive action.

In the testimony it was frequently stated that Congress increases agencies and authorizes additions to the Federal pay roll, but seldom finds it expedient to eliminate an agency or to reduce the number of Federal employees. It is difficult for us who are charged with overall legislative responsibility to visualize specific needs for reorganization and the very nature of the legislative process makes it essential that the President be given a freer hand in revamping the agencies he administers and in eliminating such agencies as are unnecessary, or the functions of such agencies when they

are duplicating services performed by other agencies.

In the past we have had similar authority conferred upon the President, but in each instance it has been so circumscribed by exemptions and provisions for special treatment to specific agencies that it has made the problems of the President extremely difficult. In the legislation before us no exemptions are provided and the President will be enabled to recommend reorganization plans in keeping with the needs which are obvious to him and without regard to special interests.

Even so, the legislation provides ample safeguards for the protection of the legislative functions of Congress through the provision by which the Congress can disapprove a plan recommended by the President and thereby make it inoperative. In order to prevent undue delay, the legislation provides for a 60-day period within which the Congress must act if it disapproves of the reorganization plan.

I think it should be pointed out that under this legislation the President can merely transfer agencies or functions of agencies or abolish agencies or functions of agencies. He cannot broaden the authority of any agency beyond that which has already been provided by law. Neither can he establish or abolish completely any executive department whose head has Cabinet status.

We talk efficiency and economy. We all know that it is urgent, especially during this period of international unrest when it is necessary that we make large expenditures in the interest of national security. Our internal economic conditions require maximum efficiency. Let us therefore proceed speedily to pass this legislation in order that the effectiveness of our domestic agencies may be increased, that the expenditures for essential services to our people may be reduced, and that our gigantic governmental activities may be put on a more businesslike basis. I hope this legislation will pass in its present form. I hope that the Members of this body will view the subject from its broadest aspects and will vote for this legislation without seeking to incorporate amendments to give special treatment to pet agencies. If we are in earnest about desiring efficiency and economy in Government, about reducing the Federal pay roll, and making better utilization of the services of Federal employees, we will act speedily to pass this legislation as it has been recommended by the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the passage of this bill to provide for the reorganization of the Government agencies, and for other purposes.

After a careful reading of the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a copy of which hearings is furnished us with a



copy of this most important bill, I conclude that Congress itself must recognize that Congress itself is not qualified, because of lack of time, opportunity, and training, to itself enter into the field of reorganization of Government agencies in the executive or administrative branches thereof. This being true, the President of the United States and his associates must have the power.

Evidence shows that for several years Congress has undertaken to pass a reorganization bill from which would flow savings of the taxpayers' money and increased efficiency; but in this bill it appears plainly to me that here is the opportunity for the best piece of legislation in this field yet enacted, or considered.

For instance, it provides no exemptions; it provides no time limit; and there is no limitation either to begin or to end, so that the President has opportunity to come before Congress with his planned reorganization at such time as he is ready to do so. The bill provides that he must examine and reexamine the reorganization of all agencies of Government and must determine what change shall be necessary to accomplish six worthy objectives, which are:

First. To promote the better execution of laws.

Second. To reduce expenditures and promote economies to the fullest extent consistent with operational government.

Third. To increase the efficiency of the operations of government.

Fourth. To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of government according to major purposes, as nearly as may be possible.

Fifth. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of government.

Sixth. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Mr. Chairman, if we were operating our own private business establishments or if we were in the employ of any of the great successful American corporations, these six objectives would be continuously called to our attention as worthy and essential. And, just because we are employed by the American taxpayers is no reason that these same six objectives should not be continuously before our great Government. Efficiency and operation of major objectives at a minimum of expense is not less essential in government than it is in private business.

The two living men best qualified to tell us their considered opinion have given us their joint opinion on the objectives of this bill—President Herbert Hoover, who happens to be a registered Republican, and President Harry Truman, who happens to be a registered Democrat. These two great Americans have joined forces and have made a recommendation to us as representatives of the people. If experience ever talks, here is where it should talk; and these two great leaders of American executive responsibilities, both past and present, tell us plainly that this bill is the bill which should pass. I am willing to take the strong recommendations of these two men. Their interests have been and are the interests of the American people in these matters.

The bill clearly protects the interests of the American people by providing that the President shall first submit proposed changes to the United States Congress; and, then, the bill gives us, as representatives of the taxpayers, a 60-day period within which to state in writing our objections. This certainly is time enough for us to act and is fair to Congress and does not hold the President up too long.

I shall vote for the bill as the committee has reported it and desires it to be enacted. This is in the interests of the public welfare.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2361. It is apparent to me after a careful reading of the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the interest of this legislation that there is a drastic and immediate need for the passage of this type of reorganization legislation.

I have paid particular attention to the testimony of a fine American and may I add one of the few Americans who has had actual experience and, with the exception of our present President, is best qualified to speak in behalf of this measure. I refer to former President Herbert Hoover. I realize, of course, that Mr. Hoover has presented not only his own views, but, as chairman of the so-called Hoover Commission, he is speaking for all of the outstanding men who comprise that Commission. In addition to his opinion, we have the benefit of the experience of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who has served as a Member of Congress and has spent many years following the subject of this legislation with extreme care. His past position, coupled with the high position he now holds, lends great weight to the force of his testimony.

The constant and steady growth of the Government of this great Nation has produced overlapping and duplication to such an extent that it is not only wasteful from a monetary standpoint but has produced great inefficiency and in many instances we have found Government departments working at odds with one another.

Every Member of Congress should read carefully, not only the testimony of these two important witnesses but the majority report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The passage of this bill will and should pave the way for more efficient government and for greater economy.

It is obvious, as we witness the increase in the national budget from year to year, that we must exert every effort to streamline our Government, eliminating waste in the interests of economy and for the benefit of taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,—*

#### TITLE I

##### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

##### NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Govern-

ment and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

##### REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions, is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

##### OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more other officers of any agency

(including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with any function or agency affected by a reorganization, as he deems necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

#### LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, establishing any new executive department, designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary," or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

(b) A reorganization plan providing for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection may not provide also for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: National Military Establishment, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new section as follows—

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is offering a new section. I have an amendment that I want to offer to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the gentleman from Michigan is offering a new section?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am offering a new subdivision under section 5, following subsection (b).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the Chair advise me whether or not the offering of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan adding a new section or paragraph will preclude me from offering my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the gentleman's amendment is otherwise in order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) No reorganization specified in the reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is submitted to Congress before January 20, 1953."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which would bring about a limitation upon the power; that is, instead of its being permanent legislation it would be limited to January 20, 1953, which would be the date of the expiration of the President's term of office.

I may say that this amendment was drawn by legislative counsel from the Comptroller General's office. This language is word for word, period, comma, and semicolon the same as the previous law. There should be some limitation upon this legislation, although some Members will probably reply that Mr. Hoover said that is not so. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I hear you gentlemen on the Democratic side quoting Mr. Hoover. I wish in previous years, in other campaigns, other elections, along in some October, all down through October and up to election day in November, you gentlemen had quoted Mr. Hoover with a little more appreciation than you did.

Many, many times from the well of the House I have heard members of the party to which the gentlemen who are now quoting Mr. Hoover with approval, who are now citing him as the embodiment of all wisdom and all patriotism, charge that almost everything disagreeable that happened to this country between January of 1928 and the day of the convening of the Eighty-first Congress was due to the mistakes, the lack of wisdom, the unsound policies, of this same Herbert Hoover.

Had Mr. Hoover's reorganization plan been accepted by a Democratic Congress, some of the evils which you seek to cure now might have been ended years ago.

Had his views been given just a little of the consideration which you now claim for them, it might not only have helped some of us on this side, but the country might have been saved billions of dollars, given greater efficiency, and the executive department might have been now operating in an efficient, economical way.

But we are willing to forget your previous criticism of our former President and his views. Many of us are happy, are thankful, to know that, at this late day, you are now recognizing the ability, the straightforwardness, of our great former President, who was so unmercifully pilloried during the years which have elapsed since he left the office.

If some of you now appreciate Mr. Hoover and his service to his country, there should be at least as much rejoicing as there was over the finding of the sheep which was lost and returned to the fold. You know what they said about that fellow who was saved at the last moment. I am glad so many have been converted to at least some of Mr. Hoover's views. Enough of that.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman means Mr. Hoover who appeared before the committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. I am thinking of Mr. Hoover as the Chairman of the Commission. I am not thinking of Mr. Hoover as a political candidate or as a former President. I take it that Mr. Hoover was not expressing entirely his own views with respect to reorganization. I take it he brought to the committee the joint views of the members of the Commission. It was a nonpartisan Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. BONNER. I just wanted the Record to show that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only point is that today so many Members of the House, so many people in this country, have recognized that there is something good in some of Mr. Hoover's views. It is an acknowledgment of a great service which has been too long delayed. That is the only point I was trying to make at this time. Conversion long delayed is a good thing, even if it comes a little late.

If the gentleman knew as much about the workings of this Commission as some other folks he would know that it was not altogether a body of but one mind, and I think Mr. Hoover has from time to time changed his views as the matter went along.

Let us get down to the pending amendment. Some day the gentleman who holds the office of President at the present time will die. He will no longer be President. He may not even be elected to a third term. No one knows who is going to be President in the future, and I want to know what you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are going to do and where you will be if along comes a President as has a previous President and sends down a reorganization plan which takes over so many of these agen-



cies, for example the USES, and puts it in the Labor Department. The House killed that one twice.

What are you going to do if you should get a President like Mr. Wallace, for example, or some other man, or even the present President who apparently gets his views on labor legislation from the Labor Department, from Phil Murray and from the CIO, and he should send down here a reorganization plan putting the Conciliation Service, the Labor Relations Board, and all of their functions in the Labor Department? What are you going to do if you have a filibuster over in the Senate and a plan like that is not acted on in 60 days? You are going to swallow it lock, stock, and barrel. We ought to think about that.

There should be some limitation on the President's power. There should be an opportunity for the House as well as for the Senate to vote on any plan he sends down here. Both House and Senate should be forced to act. You see where you are getting? You have Phil Murray sitting here on one side, John Gibson of the CIO, and Tobin of the Labor Department sitting on the other side of the President and from that combination down comes a plan, as came down this demand that we repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and go back to the old Wagner Act—a plan which the House does not like, which the House rejects unanimously, but which under this bill may still become the law of the land, either because a majority of the Senate does like it or because of a filibuster which prevents action by the Senate.

Just as sure as you adopt this plan, you some day may have a bill which neither the House nor the Senate would pass becoming the law of the land, rammed down your neck, and you will not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make the bill in that respect just like all of those that have gone before. Nothing has been done under the other bills so far. We speak of Mr. Hoover with reverence because we believe that from his experience as President of these United States he did learn some very valuable lessons that can serve us in this day. The House must have believed that when he is serving now as chairman of one of the greatest commissions this Congress has ever authorized. I do not believe there is any greater patriot in this country than our former President. We look upon him equally with all other great patriots. But he has something that no other man has; that is experience. He has been the President. He has gone through this. He asked for reorganization in his day. One of his last acts was to request that a reorganization measure might be passed in order to enable his successor to do the things that he never had an opportunity to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I did not disturb you, sir. I will not yield at this point.

So, he gave us his experience, and this committee used it. The same way with our present President. We do not question his patriotism. We do not question his love of country. I do not believe that he can be influenced by any outside influence any more than any Member of this House can be influenced by outside influence. Had you been a member of this committee you would know how much influence has been brought to bear upon the members of this committee by various agencies in order to take themselves out of the workings of this bill. But, we are bringing in a bill that we believe is the best that can be had and that we believe will do the job.

If you are going to question the integrity of somebody, then perhaps we ought to start off with a President and a former President. If you are going to agree that they have equal love of country with us, then we ought to use the valuable experience that they have gained, in arriving at a determination which brought this bill about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I do not yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But you are misquoting him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DAWSON. So, both the present President, whom you are going to charge with this responsibility, and a past President, who has had experience and can talk to us from the viewpoint of experience, ask you to take off that handicap, ask you to make this permanent legislation, ask you to give every President the responsibility of a power to do the thing which you say is necessary to be done and that only a President can do. Sure, you have had this argument in past reorganization plans, and the thing that you did then has been one of the handicaps in bringing about new organization plans.

So, I am going to ask the members of this committee, in the light of past experience, in the light of testimony of these witnesses, in the light of the job to be done for the people of this Nation, that is, setting in motion machinery that can wipe out this overlapping, that can do away with these unnecessary functions, that can streamline the operations of government, even as big business must do today, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said, to accept the bill as recommended by the committee. Big business has streamlined its own affairs. Gone are the methods of yesterday. No good businessman would stand for his organization to be in the shape that our executive department is in today.

So, I am asking you to stand back of this committee which has given a good deal of thought to this thing, heard witnesses upon it, and have brought you their sober judgment that permanent legislation is necessary in order to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements made by the chairman of our committee. I agree in a great measure with those statements. However, during the discussion of this legislation I asked that we set a termination date that this legislation might expire on. When I asked Mr. Hoover whether it should not expire in 8 years, he made the statement that he hoped it would not be necessary to continue it that long. I spoke to our committee about the 8 years, and they thought that it was too long. I was under the impression all the time that we were going to have this legislation expire in not over 4 years.

The situation is just this: We have built up this great organization of government for 150 years, and now we are going to try to readjust it. This commission has spent a couple of years getting ready the suggestions upon which the President will act, and under this amendment the President will have 3 years from this time to see that they are consummated. It seems to me it is only wise that a termination date be placed on this legislation, regardless of whether you make it 3, 4, 5, or 6 years. The amendment the gentleman has offered provides, I think, for 3 years. I cannot for the life of me see why it would not be the wise thing to do.

I quite disagree with my chairman on that one point. Otherwise, he has been handling the affairs of this committee in fine shape and has been doing a good job. I admire the way he has handled the committee. I take my hat off to him. But I do think we could put a limitation on the time for which this legislation is to extend and it would be in the best interest of the country. Speaking for myself, I shall vote for this amendment, and I hope the Members of the House will see fit to terminate this power at some time. If you pass this legislation and have no termination date, you will always be in turmoil. You will never know when a reorganization plan might be sent down from the White House, regardless of who the President might be, and at some time it will catch somebody napping and they will not be prepared for it. However, as long as we have the chairman we have now, and as long as we know there is something coming, we will be expecting plans to come in here in the next 2 or 3 years, so that if we are on the anxious seat and are waiting for something, and do not want it to pass, we will take action and see that it does not pass. However, if we let this thing ride along, I can see where damage might happen to this Government that might be irreparable.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming the bill should pass as it is, without the amendment, could not any future Congress or could not this present Congress repeal it if it wanted to?

Mr. RICH. Yes, sure; we have lots of laws. That same thing applies to just

what is trying to transpire here now. The Congress can change it, but we will not do it; that is the point. You can get action when you have a termination date or have something to do and you know you are going to do it. If you know you are going to die in 2 weeks from now you will make a will, if you do not have one already; but you say, "Oh, I can make a will any time," and you just let it ride on and on, and then you do not do it. That is the point I am trying to bring out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this matter I would say is not of tremendous and vital importance. It is a matter of policy. It is a matter which, if decided either way, would not vitally ruin the bill or vitally make the bill. It is a matter of policy which has been decided, on mature consideration, by the members of the committee after having heard testimony before the committee.

In the first place, the President has asked for this power to be made a matter of permanent legislation, and I will get to the points supporting permanent legislation in just a moment.

In the second place, the chairman of our committee asked this question of Mr. Hoover when he was before the committee, and you will find this testimony on page 137 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. This bill, Mr. Hoover, is to be permanent legislation? There has been some discussion as to whether or not it should be limited to the term of the President and then a new bill drawn as a new President comes in. Can you give us your opinion on that subject, sir?

Mr. HOOPER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.

This is not just one action of one administration or one President, it is a continuous operation. As long as the Congress has the veto, I do not see that there is any great danger in conferring such a power.

I want to point out to you that in the 1932 Reorganization Act we gave to President Roosevelt a permanent type of legislation. This is an answer to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who is my colleague on the committee, when he said that Congress would not do this. In the amended 1933 form, however, the Congress did take away the permanent type of legislation and set a limitation upon the time. That shows that Congress can, has, and could in the future function in regard to the termination of the power. The reorganization of the government is not a one-time undertaking. It is conceived as a continuing problem. Our Government is not a static type of government. It is a constantly growing and changing type of government. Every action which the Congress takes and every law which is passed by the Congress which changes the administrative function or adds to or takes from such functions, creates a different situation in administrative

powers. Therefore, there is constantly before the President the need of reorganization. That is why we are asking for permanent legislation. If at any time the President misuses that type of power, we can limit it by legislative enactment. We can speed up his action by bringing before the Congress an act which says that by a certain day he shall take such-and-such an action or the power shall be taken away from him.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In the hearings on page 143 I asked Mr. Hoover the following question:

How long do you think it will require the present President or any future Presidents to accomplish everything that should be attained in this legislation?

Mr. Hoover replied:

Well, Mr. RICH, there are two steps here. One of them is to get a definite plan and have it approved by the Congress, or, rather, have the Congress leave it alone; and the other is the taking of a number of individual steps that will each require specific legislation. I take it that we will be in the throes of reorganization even with the utmost cooperation for at least over a year before we will get the machine working and in a position to give us the subsequent benefits. This is no easy task.

Then I asked him this question:

Therefore, it is going to take a lot of time; even 6 or 8 years would not be too long for the Chief Executive to have his organization get things in preparation to make suggestions, would it?

Mr. Hoover said—and this is the point I want to make:

It certainly is quite a period. I hope it is not that long because I would like to live to see the end of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Hoover, of course, was referring in that conversation, as I take it, to the Hoover Commission reports, and it is not conceded that the Hoover Commission reports will be the last attempt to reorganize the administrative part of our Government machinery.

Mr. RICH. I have been trying my best to make it clear that what I wanted to know was how long it would take the President to effect this organization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman does not want the House to think that once action is taken on the present Hoover Commission reports that that will end for all time the necessity for continuing scrutiny of government and continuing reorganization.

Mr. RICH. Oh, no; I would not want to try to fool anybody any place anytime. I want to be straight, open, and above-board, and tell them just what I think. If anybody has the idea that I am trying to fool anybody I wish that they would get that out of their mind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman is not trying to fool anyone, but I just wanted to clarify a point in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize there is a great deal of good in the Hoover Commission report and a great deal of good

in this bill. I recognize the imperative need for reorganization in Government and greater efficiency in Government and for more economies and for the reduction of expenses; but I want to take this time to voice this serious thought with reference to the Army engineers:

This bill goes as far as the committee felt it should go with reference to assisting in the demand which I hear voiced in this Congress regarding the administrative integrity of the Army engineers. This bill separates the program of reorganization so that any plan involving the national defense will come back separately to the Congress and therefore receive a separate vote. However, I feel that the Army engineers have done such a grand job, both in peace and in war, that no reorganization of the Army engineers should occur. I wanted to take just this moment to voice this opinion. I have made a study of the work, as I am sure have a great many other Members of Congress. The Army engineers have done a wonderful job and they are now doing a magnificent job.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the argument which the gentleman is advancing with reference to the Army engineers apply equally to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. BROOKS. In a sense it applies equally; but in another sense I do not think it does apply equally. The Army engineers are in a peculiar position. The Army engineers perform in time of war as a part of our national defense. In time of peace the Army engineers perform as a part of our peacetime set-up. They perform differently from any other agency of Government. That is the reason I felt that I should take this brief opportunity to voice the serious concern which I feel in reference to any effort to change the Army engineers, in the handling of their civil functions as given to them by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman may know, there is a provision in the bill, on page 7, which would require that in respect to four named agencies, any reorganization proposal must come up in respect to them apart from and independent of any other proposal. One of those so referred to is the National Military Establishment.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been represented to me by some members of the Committee on Armed Services that that definition is broad enough to include the civil functions of the Army engineers. I am wondering if the gentleman so interprets it, or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] so interprets it.

Mr. BROOKS. That is my interpretation. I will say I have discussed the bill with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and with other Members, and I personally feel it is broad enough to cover the civil functions of the Army



engineers. But I cannot fail to feel some serious concern regarding any proposal that would seek to change the set-up by which the Army engineers handle the civil functions of the War Department.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder, for future use in determining the legislative intent, if some members of the committee on the majority side would say whether the language includes the Army engineers.

Mr. BROOKS. I trust the Members, by exercising use of the time they have in the course of debate, will express themselves. I am sorry that time does not permit at this time for them to express themselves. I want to continue to say that I have seen the work of the Army engineers in time of war and I think they must continue to have peacetime work to train them for emergencies. They must have "civil functions work" in time of peace, in order that they be an efficient, hard-working force in our national defense organization in time of war. I hope that no plan of reorganization coming to this body will take any present powers from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana who has just spoken has raised a very important question, and our distinguished former leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has tried to clarify that. I think this is the right time to have an expression from the chairman of the committee, because, if this does not include the civil functions of the Army engineers I am sure the temper of this House is such that we can insert language that will do that. I would like to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs on this proposition.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest to the Committee in the interest of orderly procedure that we dispose of the Hoffman amendment and then later deal with the question that has been raised by the gentleman from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Ohio. We are beginning to get just a little bit confused. The question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is whether this legislation should be permanent or whether it should terminate in 1953. When we come to the section dealing with the Military Establishment we will have a clear opportunity to debate the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree with him that that will be the logical place to discuss this, but, inasmuch as it has been injected into the debate, I think it should be clarified now. What I want is that the Army engineers be not disturbed in the work they do for civil activities of the Government. We all know that the Army engineers are one of the most efficient agencies of the Government, and I am sure that Congress will not do this group

any injustice. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will introduce the proper amendment at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I hope that the Committee of the Whole will vote the amendment down. There are certain compelling reasons which prompt me to oppose his amendment. Experience has shown as a result of the passage of certain reorganization bills during the past 16 years or so that the fears we have entertained in the past need no longer be entertained by us. Furthermore, the reorganization of the executive branch is a continuing affair. I have no fear about a future President of the United States. I have no fear of a President after 1953; if it is not President Truman I have confidence that the man who will be in the White House will perform his duty in accordance with his trust and to the best of his ability, having in mind the best interests of our country and our people. I might disagree with him, but that is different from impugning his motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not saying that the gentleman does, that is not raised in the gentleman's amendment and I know it does not exist in the gentleman's mind, but I am expressing my thoughts as to why I oppose the amendment. In no way do I want my remarks to be construed by anyone as a thought on my part that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] entertains any opposite view to the one I have expressed in relation to confidence in the present or any future President. But I think we have had the experience that justifies us now in making permanent legislation out of a reorganization bill.

President Truman, in his message to Congress, specifically on two occasions emphasized that he hoped the Congress would pass a bill of a permanent nature; and former President Hoover, the only living ex-President we have with us today—and let us hope that he will be with us for many, many years to come—also is in complete agreement with President Truman. Each is in agreement with the other. Here we have one, the present President, one a former President, one elected as a Democrat, the other elected as a Republican, both urging the Congress of the United States to make this type of legislation permanent. I appreciate the fears entertained by those who want a limitation, and in disagreement I want any Member to know that I thoroughly respect his views and his right to entertain the views he has; but I think in the light of the evidence, in the light of the situation that confronts us now, and with our experience that we can take this step with permanent legislation particularly when two such eminent Americans as the President of the United States and a former President of the United States, both men of experience as Chief Executive of this country, are agreed on it.

One is the leader, from a party standpoint, of the Democratic Party. Notice I did not say as President, but as leader.

As President he is President of all the people. He is a leader of the Democratic Party. No one will disagree with the statement that former President Hoover is one of the outstanding leaders of our country today and probably the recognized leader of the Republican Party. I think we can accept their judgment in the light of their past experience with confidence and vote to have this legislation permanent in nature.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in the estimate the gentleman has made of the two individuals of whom he has been speaking. If when the act expires we have a President in whom everybody has confidence there will of course be no difficulty in extending it. But if the day comes when we have a President in whom we do not have confidence, we cannot easily end the power granted. He would veto our action and it would require a two-thirds vote. A doctor hopes for the best but prepares for the worst. If we should someday get a man as President that we cannot trust, we have given away our chance of bringing this power back to the legislative body. It is just when we might want to take it back that we would find we cannot.

Mr. McCORMACK. I stated that I respect the views of those who disagree with me; however, I think my friend is reacting to fear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, the only proposition involved here is whether or not we are going to make this a law of men or a law of the country. As I see it, under this proposal we are making the President of the United States supreme. It is my duty, after swearing to uphold the Constitution of the United States, to make this a country of laws and not of men. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this does not make it a country of laws but a country of men.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Does the gentleman appreciate that if there ever should come a time when we have a President in whom the Congress does not have confidence, and he sent down a reorganization plan to the Congress, the Congress could reject that plan?

Mr. NICHOLSON. We probably could.

Mr. DAWSON. Is it the gentleman's understanding of the bill that the power to reject is always in the Congress?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not think it is in the Congress. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan there is a limitation, namely, 1953. Under the bill as it is presently written they have an opportunity to keep it there forever, so far as he is concerned.

Mr. DAWSON. The President submits a plan to the Congress and the Congress can reject under the method provided by this bill. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I know what the bill provides, but I have seen bills work. If a party is in control all the time, then they go along with the President, or I assume they do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], hit the nail on the head when he said that we are placing a power in the hands of the President which in order to get back would require a two-thirds vote of the House and a two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to get it back into the hands of the Congress? Therefore we ought to have a time limit on this legislation. It seems to me that is most important. A lot of times some of you gentlemen have voted for legislation to give power to the Chief Executive and then have later regretted it. You had better be careful that you are not going to give away your birthright again.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I also agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd]. I am afraid of giving one man control of anything, and as long as we have an opportunity I think we ought to take advantage of it and go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I have heard a great deal about putting a lot of trust in the Chief Executive. Does the gentleman not feel that we ought to have the same trust in this body 4 years from now; that it might be possible to extend the time if it was found necessary to be extended?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want a law written on books so that we will know what the law is, and not depend upon whether a man is honest or dishonest or whether he is a good executive or a bad one. If you want to put something in the law, write it in there so that the people will know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 7, line 20, after the word "commission" strike out the period and insert the following: "National Mediation Board, National Rail-

road Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, United States Tariff Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Federal Trade Commission, and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I spoke on this matter at some length and I do not know as it is necessary to repeat too much of that now. I recalled then and I think probably I should recall now, because some of you may not have been here, that as these basic reorganization proposals have come up here from time to time there has been experienced on both sides of the aisle a great concern about the possible threat to the independence of action of the great quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial bodies of the Government. They are the creatures of the Congress. They are to carry out the will of the Congress. They should not be subjected to political control and certainly their actions and their decisions which so vitally affect the economy of the country should not be in the realm of political action. That is why many of us through the years have sought to protect their independence. That generally took the effect of specific exemptions in the legislation that we passed. Most recently, in 1945, there were a number of specific exemptions, and there was also language in that act that undertook to prohibit the limitation of the exercise of the independence of these agencies in respect to their quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions. Also in the 1945 act was a new device. It was a device that did not provide for exemption, and this amendment that I have provides for no exemption, but that device simply said that in respect to these great agencies any reorganization proposal affecting them shall come up here independent of any other reorganization proposal.

That is just simply so the Congress could act on that proposal without any reference to any other proposal, and make its determination. I say it does provide some fair safeguard for the continuing independence of those agencies and at the same time can affect in no way the effective operation of this legislation.

If you have before you a copy of the bill, you will find on page 7, in subsection (b), in the last of that paragraph, four different agencies are so treated. They are not exempted, but it just simply is provided that separate plans shall come up for them. They are the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. My amendment would simply add to that list a list that I assume is in this legislation with administration approval—in fact, I know it is in there that way because it has been so stated in the papers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is included in the list of four presently in the bill. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is the same kind of an agency. It regulates the air carriers just as the ICC regulates the surface carriers.

As I said earlier in the debate, I want to support this legislation. I am sup-

porting it. I worked on the committee in support of it. I offered this amendment in the committee. If any of you thinks that someone in some agency has pressured me into offering this amendment, may I disabuse your mind. No one has spoken to me about it. My action in this regard comes only from a deep conviction about the matter and a deep sense of the responsibility that I feel I owe the country in respect to the preservation of the independence of action of these great agencies.

I trust that this amendment can be adopted. As I say, it is no exemption, let us understand that. It simply provides that in respect to any one of these agencies the matter would come here free and clear of any sort of an entanglement, before the Congress could act on it.

I recall how the gentleman from Georgia came before the committee to get in there the language "National Military Establishment." He was quite vehement and vigorous in his contentions before the committee. He said, "All we want is our day in court in the Congress of the United States. All we want is the right to come in before the Congress and debate whatever plan may be up there affecting the Military Establishment, and not have it involved with other considerations."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am very much interested in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Does the gentleman's amendment include that?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, it does.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think that should not be disturbed.

Mr. HALLECK. That was given the same treatment in the 1945 act. Also the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Board—I have that language here before me, but they were given the same treatment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I certainly do not want this agency to go into the Federal Reserve.

Mr. HALLECK. I know many people have had concern about that.

This treatment in the 1945 act was accorded the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration. I did not include the Veterans' Administration.

I might also add that there was specific exemption in the 1945 act for the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the civil functions of the Army engineers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate the gentleman on leaving the Veterans' Administration out of the provisions of



his amendment because the Commission is making a special report to the Congress on the Veterans' Administration alone. The Veterans' Administration will be considered by the President and by the Congress as a single entity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have another illustration by the offering of this amendment of an experience in connection with this legislation. In the first bill there were 21 exemptions. That was due to fear. In a later bill there were 12 or 14 exemptions and they were based on fear. Of course, it was honestly entertained at the time. But as time passed on and we gained experience we realized that in many cases some of our fears were unjustified. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will add a number of other agencies to the formula established by this bill in relation to the four agencies. The adoption of the amendment will only hinder reorganization and not help it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, this is not an exemption to begin with. But does the gentleman contend that the inclusion of the four agencies named in the bill is a hindrance to reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that those were exemptions. I said they were additions to the formula already in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the additions will hinder reorganization, then will the gentleman say that the inclusion of the four agencies hindered reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. They hinder it much less than if the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted. We are very practical men. We realize there were 21 exemptions in the first bill which were placed in the bill because of practical considerations. Then as we gained experience because of practical considerations there were 12 or 14 exemptions. Then we have had several more years of practical experience. As a result of that, we have had no exemptions, but specific reorganizations in the case of four of our agencies; that is, three agencies and one department. Again that is the result of practical experience. Now, what does former President Hoover say in his testimony on this particular subject?

The reasons for his views against any exemptions are:

I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi legislative and quasi judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans, and I should not imagine he is going to propose to do otherwise than to remove purely executive functions.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Speaking of the matter of hindrance, the gentleman earlier referred to the reorganization proposal in respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. As I remember it, that was carried through to a successful conclusion, and it came up here as an order standing by itself, and affecting nothing other than the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. So there was accomplishment under this very formula in respect to that agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman will remember the furor that was raised at the time, and the fears that were entertained that it was going to put the agency into politics and that decisions would be made along political lines, and that it would lose its independence, although it was given independence within the Department of Commerce. None of the dire predictions has resulted.

Earlier in the day I called attention to a situation where the intent of Congress in the establishment of independent agencies has outgrown itself. It is not a question of one or two agencies that are arms of the Congress. We now have many of them. They are performing both quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and executive functions. We have established for all practical purposes—and this has no application to the Department of National Defense, because that is a department in itself—we have established in these independent agencies, for all practical purposes, a fourth department of government, and it is not enumerated in the Constitution.

The adoption of this amendment now, in the light of the experience we have had, in my opinion, would be a serious hindrance to real reorganization, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this time is taken to state that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], speaking previously, intended to say that I had some distrust of the motives of either former President Hoover or the present occupant of the White House, he was completely mistaken. I am not distrusting anybody, and I want that made perfectly clear.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish the gentleman to know I have the highest opinion of him and that no word of mine was intended to impute to the gentleman anything but the highest motives. My words were not calculated to state a feeling as stated by the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is very kind, and I thank the gentleman very, very much.

This amendment is not a move to exempt these agencies, neither the four nor the additional ones proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. If you will read the section, you will notice that all that section requires is that these plans, as to this, that, or the other department, come up one at a time; just one at a time, so that the Congress may have an opportunity to act intelligently on the plan.

You will all recall that some time ago the President sent up three or more reorganization plans. One of those plans included three separate and distinct proposals, and it was rejected. It was rejected because of the inclusion, with two good ones, of one that the Congress, both the House and the Senate, considered inadvisable. That is why I think the committee accepted the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], with reference to the Military Establishment. And then the others were added.

Now, the present amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] merely asks that these other departments be considered in the same way. If the President wants to send up a plan, he should send it up in one package—not two, but one—so that the Congress will have an opportunity, both Houses, to act. We can get along with this thing very quickly.

When he was on the floor before the gentleman from Indiana asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield, the gentleman from Illinois yielded. Then the gentleman from Indiana said:

I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission with the enactment of this legislation and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] replied:

I think we ought to get a reorganization plan submitted to this Congress within the next few months.

There you are. In the revision made by the gentleman I notice the gentleman said, "Within a very short time."

So if these plans will come up one at a time, one agency at a time reorganized, the Congress can very easily pass upon that one simple question; so I think we should have this amendment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, these agencies named in the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] are agencies that have been created by this Congress and that in the

discharge of their duties they are independent of the control of the Chief Executive, just like a court would be to act upon a lawsuit brought before it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. But if they are included within this reorganization plan, then the President could reduce them to mere automatons or people who could be pushed about and whose decisions might be controlled by the Executive.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that but I venture to bring it up here, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] insisted with reference to the armed services—and I remember he appeared before the committee and there were 45 votes he told us on his committee. I do not think that was with any intimation that we ought to watch out for those 45 votes, but anyway he told us of those votes.

There is no reason at all why these other agencies should not come up in the same way. They are entitled to just as much consideration, I say, as the one that comes before the committee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I notice he has nodded his head. I wish he would get up and make a talk.

Mr. VINSON. I will in a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Make a talk now before my time runs out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would not this amendment, if adopted, prevent these railroad agencies from being absorbed, or taken up by some other agency or department, without having their day in court, without giving them a right to be heard? I am particularly interested in the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railway Mediation Board, and the National Railway Adjustment Board. I would like to see them if possible have their day in court before they are absorbed into some other agency. These organizations are self-supporting and do not cost the taxpayers one cent for administration or any other purpose.

Mr. DAWSON. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No"; they would have their day in court under the bill as written.

Mr. BREHM. They would?

Mr. DAWSON. They would.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 86, noes 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 7, line 20, after the words "Securities and Exchange Commission", strike out the period, insert a comma and add "Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, and National Railroad Retirement Adjustment Board."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, these agencies were included in the amendment that has just been defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that this is a different amendment in that in the previous amendment there were additional agencies included. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, despite the action taken on the previous amendment I want to press for the adoption of the present one. I predicate my position on the assumption that the committee which studied this legislation and reported it to the House must have had some sound, basic reasons for extending preferential consideration to the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there are sound basic reasons why the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board should be extended this same preferential treatment.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Railroad Retirement Board is not a Government functioning body. There are no governmental tax moneys involved. This is a Board created and financed by assessments against the wages of the individual workers in the railroad industry and the railroad companies. The Government only functions in the status of a trustee. I never heard tell of a trusteeship being dissolved except by some order of the court. I thought a trusteeship once set up was sacred. Yet we are proposing to bring this in under one of the other departments of our Government which may drag these agencies into politics. If there is one thing you can say about its administration and its functioning in the past it has been free of politics. What is said about the Railroad Retirement Act can also be said about the Railroad Mediation Board. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there has been less trouble between labor and management in the functioning of that Board than in all the other labor legislation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I entirely agree with my distinguished friend. A large number of railroad employees from my home town of Knoxville brought that very question up to me as I came in this Chamber this morning. It would be a blunder, and I think a grievous blunder, to interfere in any manner with the independent, impartial status of those agencies.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I also agree with the gentleman. A bit ago I asked the question if they would have their day in

court, and the chairman of the committee assured me that they would have. Now, would it not be possible, if this legislation becomes a law, to group these railway agencies in with other legislation which might have some good features in it, and then have the railway organizations become lost in the shuffle and become part of the Labor Department?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. Which we do not want.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. In addition, let me say that I assume the object of this reorganization bill is one of economy. I remember that there was a tremendous amount of savings stressed when the committee proposing this legislation reported it. The assumption is that you will be able to let out hundreds of thousands of Federal workers. I want to say to you that there are probably less than 150 or 200 employees involved in all three or four of these railroad boards for which I am asking this preferential treatment. You will not effect any savings to speak of, because there are only a few employees attached to each one of the functions. I would also like to ask the consideration of the House that we keep, so far as possible, just as many of our governmental functions out of politics as possible. I believe it can be said of these railroad functions that they are not now and have not been matters of party politics, and I strenuously object to their inclusion in one of the ordinary functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that he realizes that the Railroad Retirement Act sets up the Railroad Retirement Board and that the function thereof is basic legislation; that no change could be made in the death benefits or the pensions or any other functions of that act. It would require enabling legislation to be sent to the Congress, and if any administrative economy could be performed within the Board itself, the gentleman certainly would not object to the President, who is deeply concerned with the rights of labor, presenting a plan for the Congress to decide upon that would recommend certain economic or efficiency measures within it without changing any of the basic provisions.

Mr. BREHM. How about the Social Security Administration?

Mr. BAILEY. I will answer the gentleman by saying that regardless of what action we may take, it is still a trust fund and I do not think that Congress should have any business dealing with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend any remarks that I make on the floor today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.



Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For a question.

Mr. BREHM. I just want to say that in my opinion it would be a shame to put any of the railroad boards under the Social Security Administration, which could happen if this legislation passes as it is now written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would be worse if you put it under the Labor Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering what position the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] are going to take on this amendment. As I said a moment ago, I do not distrust or challenge the motives of the President or of any former President nor, I may add, of any Member of the House or the other body, but I try to be a realist. But it is strange indeed that all the trust must be on one side. If we should not and if we do not mistrust the present President, why should not the President trust the present Congress, or at least trust a majority of the 435 Members of this body, a majority of the 96 Members of the other body?

Why not mutual trust? Why not require the other body and the House, or at least one body entrusted with the legislative power, to act, as the Constitution contemplated, affirmatively upon any matter presented to it before the matter became the law of the land? I am wondering now, when from the press, at least, yes, when from a committee of the other body, the Labor Committee, come reports that the Secretary of Labor came up and asked for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and if I understood correctly, the reenactment of the Wagner Act. He asked for the transfer of the Mediation Service over to the Department of Labor. He is going to make the National Labor Relations Board, if he gets the legislation he wants, a part of the Department of Labor.

We notice in the press that organized labor is saying to the President, "We elected you," and let me add that they are saying that to the Members of the House and I assume to the Members of the other body. "We elected you; now, come on. Give us what we say you promised during the campaign."

The CIO is only one segment of labor. The railroad men are laborers and workers, too. They are saying, "If this railroad legislation and the railroad organizations are going to be at the mercy of the President, if he wants to send down a plan sticking them over in the Department of Labor, reject it. We do not want that." Do you gentlemen in the majority want these independent agencies or their functions, their duties, transferred to the Department of Labor, which is under the control of or is favorable—and rightly so—to organized labor? But to all of it—not just to the CIO as it seems to assume.

Of course, the Labor Department speaks for organized labor, but unfortunately at the moment it is speaking for one segment of organized labor. The CIO assumes that it elected the

President and a majority of the Members of Congress, so they are demanding now—not only asking, they are demanding now—that the Congress come across and pay for that election by legislation favorable to it. Put some of these agencies like the Railway Retirement Board in Social Security or the Labor Department and soon you may find CIO again raiding the A. F. of L. and perhaps the railway unions.

I agree with the gentleman who just left the well of the House that labor legislation which applies to the railroad workers has worked exceptionally well over the years. No one has found any particular fault with it. So if it is to be tampered with—let us say, if it is to be improved, let it come up as the gentleman then proposed, in one package, so that the Congress, this House and the other body, may have the opportunity of saying whether we want that labor organization to be transferred over to and put under the jurisdiction of the Labor Department or the Social Security Agency.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is just some of the procedure that the Congresses have faced in past years and have yielded to, and by virtue of having yielded, have passed bills that did not enable the President to do the job they were hoping he would do.

You saw these organizations or these branches or agencies named here included in an amendment a few moments ago. You saw them voted down. Then you saw them come to us once again standing by themselves, on the theory that we are going to do something to them, that this bill does something to them.

This bill is not going to put any agency anywhere. This bill is not going to interfere with any agency, to take anything from them or give them anything. This bill is plainly enabling legislation in order to give the power to the President to do a job of reorganization that must be done.

All these agencies that come and ask us now to make special provision for them are but the creatures of ourselves, the creatures of the Congress. Any plan the President submits or draws up or presents must come back to the Congress once again.

The legislation provides that the plan must be sent to the Congress. After the plan comes to the Congress, the Speaker of the House will refer it to the appropriate committee. There the committee is given a certain length of time to take action on it. Then a friend of any agency that is affected by that plan—not by this legislation but by that plan which the President submits—may file a resolution to reject it. That goes to the committee. If they do not act on it, then any member who is in favor of that resolution can move to discharge the committee and bring it to the floor of the Congress. Therefore, this bill makes adequate provision to protect every agency. The President cannot do anything to any agency unless it comes back to the Congress. What are we going to do here today? Are we going to pass a

bill which is going to do the job which should be done? If any of these agencies are examined and if any of the Executive powers can be changed to the benefit of the taxpayers, should not that be done? In 1 minute we hear talk about the size of the Government and how the agencies are eating up the taxpayers money. I have heard Members standing here telling us about some of these same agencies which now do not want to be included in this bill. They tell us that they have grown so big that no Congressman can talk to them any more.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Under the decision recently rendered by the Chair, if this amendment carries, then it will follow that each item which was defeated in the so-called Halleck amendment can come up one by one and other items can come up one by one. Thus you will be here all afternoon voting on separate agencies when they have all been beaten collectively in the so-called Halleck amendment.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, may I say further, we have had our public hearings. Every agency had an opportunity to appear before us. If there were any reasons then to do the thing which they seek to have you do now, your committee would have acted thereon. Therefore, I am saying that this is but an instance of how former Congresses have failed to do the thing we are now trying to do. We have endeavored to bring to the Committee of the Whole a bill that will work. We have tried to bring to this committee a bill under which the President can reorganize the executive departments and do all the things that we have been talking about. The terms of the legislation are clear. There are no exemptions in it, and there should be no exemptions in it.

The President is not going to interfere with any agency that is functioning in the best interests of the people. If the President did interfere, do you not know that officials of that agency would immediately alert the very Members who are standing here now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was not the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] limiting debate granted by the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is referring to a request made concerning the previous amendment and which does not apply to the pending amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. The gentleman has made very much of a point of the fact that exemption of this railroad retirement group would prevent a great deal of money being saved to the taxpayers. I would like to have you show me how in any way, if you cut down the

amount of money that is spent by that organization, cut it in half, how you would in any way help the taxpayers, bearing in mind that of the money that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board, 6 percent comes out of the employee and 6 percent from the employer. How would you save the taxpayers any money? This is truly an independent function.

Mr. DAWSON. Are there any administrative workers there at all? Do they exercise any functions of the executive department at all?

Mr. WITHROW. They are all paid out of the money that comes into the fund by reason of the 6 percent that is taken from the employee's wages, and the 6 percent that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board by the railroad companies.

Mr. DAWSON. This bill does nothing to destroy any function set up by law, nor can any reorganization plan of the President do that; but if there are any executive functions, either in itself or related to other agencies, then the President can combine them, in order to have them work more efficiently, or for the sake of economy, and then it will be brought down in a plan, and if it is not a good plan, you and the others in this Congress, including myself, will reject that plan.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman has not answered my question. My question is: How will the taxpayers be saved any money, if you cut the railroad retirement administration 50 percent?

Mr. DAWSON. If you cut it in two, you would be bound to save some money.

Mr. WITHROW. Where would that money go? It would go back into the fund, would it not?

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly.

Mr. WITHROW. And how would it save the taxpayers any money?

Mr. DAWSON. If in its administrative function any of the personnel can be cut down which are paid for by the Government, then that will be a saving to the taxpayers. Your question has nothing to do with the Government. You seek to intimate that this legislation can affect basic legislation where we set up an agency. That cannot be done under this bill and that cannot be done under any reorganization plan proposed by the President.

Mr. WITHROW. You are attempting to place me in a position that I will not be placed in.

Mr. DAWSON. And you are attempting to put words into my mouth.

Mr. WITHROW. No; just a moment. I am in favor of this legislation. I have confidence that the President of the United States will do a good job, but I do object to your saying that it is going to save the taxpayers any money when the taxpayers do not have anything to do with this Board.

Mr. DAWSON. There are some of its functions that are executive. Then those employees must be paid by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]

made the very point which has disturbed me so much. The gentleman said that if we now pass this amendment relating to the railroad boards, then each of the others previously voted down in the Halleck amendment will come up in turn, and you will be voting on all of them all over again. That is exactly what can happen to the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Service, and the Adjustment Board. They can be lost in the shuffle. They can be pushed into another agency, say, like Social Security, and be brought up here and thereby lose their identity. What is wrong in permitting those agencies to be brought up here separately and acted upon? You bring them up in one large package and there may be incorporated in that particular package something which may be good; and you will destroy them. That is exactly what I am fearful of. You will vote for the good in the package and take the evil along with it.

Mr. DAWSON. That very thing would prevent the President from ever putting a bad plan in with a good plan.

Mr. BREHM. Oh, he is still a human being and subject to the frailties of human nature. A person can be sincere and still make mistakes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment ago the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made a statement that we wanted to vote on this bill tonight and therefore we should not fool around with quite so much debate, or words to that effect.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is not correct. Now, let us get it straight. The question that is now being debated has been debated and has been voted on. By a ruling of the Chair, the question has arisen again individually, or in this case with two or three other organizations thrown in.

Mr. BREHM. It is not going to cost anyone a penny nor is it going to save a penny for anyone if this amendment prevails. However, it may save a most essential service to the railway brotherhoods for which they and their employers have been paying for the past 10 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; all right; and under—

Mr. DAWSON. So it is just a repetition of the debate and a repetition of the decision which the committee has already made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I admire the gentleman very much. I am sorry I cannot agree with him in this instance. We should have some opportunity to debate the bill. If you expect to finish this bill tonight, do not force us too much.

Neither in the committee nor in the House has anyone on the minority side raised the slightest objection or done anything to delay matters, but we do want to discuss some of these items; and, if you go to strict parliamentary procedure and gag us, you cannot possi-

bly vote on this bill tonight if somebody wants to object; not tonight. All we want is a little consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 122, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 7, line 20, after the period insert the following: "No reorganization plan containing any provision affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to such civil functions shall take effect until the two Houses of Congress pass a concurrent resolution which states in substance that the Congress favors such new reorganization plan."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am not an enemy to this legislation; this is a friendly amendment and I am supporting this bill because I believe this Congress should approve of anything that would bring economy in our Government, less spending, and more efficient Government, and the doing away with duplication and overlapping.

I am sure none of us has had any criticism of the Corps of United States Army Engineers. They are doing a wonderful job. They have been in existence for 174 years and I do not know of any organization plan that could better the operations of this particular branch of our Government.

I am not asking by my amendment that the Corps of Engineers be exempted from any reorganization plan. In the act that we passed in 1945 that organization was exempted and I have used the same language in this amendment as was used in section 5, subsection (e), of the reorganization bill passed in 1945.

We are all satisfied with what the Army Engineers are doing. They work in peacetime taking care of our floods, taking care of our rivers and harbors, and taking care of a lot of our problems that are particularly interesting to our local governments.

I do not see how anyone can have any possible objection to my amendment. My amendment says that before any reorganization plan in reference to the Corps of Engineers shall go into effect the Congress must approve by concurrent resolution. In other words, it is affirmative action instead of negative action. If we take it as it is and they are involved in some reorganization plan, then we have to act within a period of 60 days, else the plan becomes effective.

The Corps of Army Engineers is primarily for the people. This is something you ought to be interested in. I do not want any plan to go into effect, whether proposed by the President or anybody else, until the Congress has had an opportunity to scrutinize the program and the purposes therein. When the Congress has it up for consideration, the Congress could say: "Mr. President, you have done a good job, and we approve it. The Corps of Engineers ought to be



changed." When that happens and the Congress agrees, good and well. The organization itself is not exempted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If the Corps of Engineers are not taken out of the bill where do they go and how do they function?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot answer that question because I do not know where they are going. But if we adopt this amendment, before anything is done, before any plan becomes operative and effective, this Congress by affirmative vote must say it is a good plan and we must affirmatively adopt it by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. It takes action on the part of both Houses. If we get some plan that is not good we can reject it. This is simply a question of whether we are going forward or backward.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman said that he could not answer the gentleman's question in regard to where the civil functions of the Army Engineers would go. I think I have the answer. Those functions could be taken over by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, insofar as reclamation projects are concerned, or flood control, in areas where reclamation, irrigation, power, and flood control go together, and they certainly should be combined.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Nothing could be done so far as the Army Engineers are concerned, and no plan could become effective until the House and Senate by affirmative action stated it could be. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request the attention of the committee while I try to explain what is meant by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, and what is proposed in subsection (b). The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked if by using the words "National Military Establishment" it included the civil functions. I respectfully call his attention and the attention of the committee to the Security Act of July 26, 1947, which specifically sets out what constitutes the National Military Establishment. It states:

The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title I of this act.

So there can be no doubt, wherever used in the law, the words "National Military Establishment" do include all component parts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Then there can be no doubt in the gentleman's mind that the civil functions of the Army Engineers is a secondary matter with them, and that their connection with the Army itself brings them within this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely; there is no doubt about it. This amendment was prepared by the Drafting Service not only of the Armed Services Committee but by the Drafting Service of the House, so the House can fully understand that wherever used in here, "National Military Establishment" means the civil functions of the Army Engineers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I want the Record to show that in putting the National Military Establishment in here, that the committee intended that that included the United States engineers within this formula.

Mr. VINSON. If there is any doubt in any man's mind, and to make it doubly sure, after the words "National Military Establishment," someone could offer an amendment to put in brackets "including the civil functions of the Department of the Army." But there is absolutely no need to do so because the words "National Military Establishment" mean all components of these services.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts was at one time a member of the committee from which this bill originates, and is now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am a member now.

Mr. VINSON. To set the record straight, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments if he does not interpret the words "National Military Establishment" to include the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

Mr. DAWSON. That was the understanding of the committee, and the language was used with that in view.

Mr. VINSON. That is it exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would this give the President the power to delimit the jurisdiction of the Engineers? For instance, one of the members suggested that they should not build any more stands. Could the President take out that part and the rivers and harbors part?

Mr. VINSON. In 2 or 3 minutes I will explain what this amendment does. I appeared before the committee and suggested that an amendment along this line be considered. The committee after considerable debate reached the conclusion to draft it in the language set out in the bill.

Now, what does it do? I am addressing this strictly to the Military Establishment. It simply means if the President of the United States wished to sub-

mit to the Congress a reorganization plan to take the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers away from the War Department and put it in the Interior Department, he would have to send that up here in a reorganization plan separate and distinct. It could not be tied in with any reorganization plan with reference to any other civil agencies or functions of different departments. It would have to come here so that the Congress could determine that sole cut issue, and, of course, as a Member of the House, if such an issue comes up, I would be very much opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is still this question: Could they take part of the jurisdiction of the Engineers away from them?

Mr. VINSON. He could not touch the Corps of Engineers or any agency of the National Military Establishment and mix it up with any other function of the Government. They have to come here separate and distinct. This language is so written that he cannot take one thing away. However, he can do this: He can add some other agencies to the Military Establishment without sending it separate, but he cannot take one iota of the power or authority from the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force without sending it here as a separate proposition. That is all it does.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that my amendment is in accord with the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would disturb the whole situation, because he would require it to be an affirmative act instead of a negative act. He would require that the Congress would have to approve it in a particular resolution by a vote of the House and Senate, and the bill is based on a different basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that they would have to do that anyhow, according to the statement made here? Before the organization could do anything there would have to be a plan?

Mr. VINSON. The provisions of the bill are such that when it comes in here the committee taking jurisdiction of it must act within a certain time. If one House disapproves it and the other House approves it, it becomes a reorganization plan. The gentleman's statement provides that before it can become a reorganization plan it must have the sanction of both Houses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it not also mean that if this amendment is adopted the President could not take the Corps of Engineers or the civil functions and place them over in the Department of the Interior, and then say to that Department, "From now on you shall have charge of all the river and harbor work of this country"?

Mr. VINSON. He would have the authority to do so. He would have the authority to take the Marines and put them in the Army. He would have the authority to take Naval Aviation and put it in the Air Force. But when he would do it, he would have to send it to Congress on that one issue and then Congress could debate it. I am perfectly willing on any reorganization plan to have an opportunity to present the reasons why certain things should not take place.

Mr. DONDERO. But only in case the gentleman's amendment passes this House.

Mr. VINSON. No. His amendment would disturb it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve. May I say that I am, of course, deeply concerned that the status of the Engineers be not changed.

Mr. VINSON. So am I.

Mr. BROOKS. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. VINSON. I am very much opposed to taking them away.

Mr. BROOKS. Is not the proper interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman that no reorganization can occur but what every Member of the House of Representatives will have the right, in the event the committee fails to report it, to call it up for a vote before the House?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I am merely safeguarding this organization by saying that when you propose to reorganize it you cannot mix it up, you must send it in in a separate package, and any Member of Congress, under the bill, has a right to call it up and let a majority of Congress determine what is the proper thing to do about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield further, the Rogers amendment would not do that; it would just muddy the waters.

Mr. VINSON. The amendment would accomplish just exactly what I have said. It is as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it the Rogers amendment about which the gentleman is talking?

Mr. VINSON. I am talking about what is in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has offered an amendment.

Mr. VINSON. His amendment in the first place is not necessary, because the Corps of Engineers is within the purview of the committee bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, exactly. Therefore, I am asking this Committee to vote

down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] because it is not necessary. The Corps of Engineers is amply protected. We will have a separate vote on it whenever it comes in here. That is not the only thing in the reorganization of the Department of National Defense that might come up. There are other important items that might come up.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. Under the present law which you favor, if there were a reorganization proposal for the National Military Establishment set down which provided for something that the House did not approve of and the House rejected the proposal, it would still go to the other body and if approved there, the reorganization plan would take effect, would it not?

Mr. VINSON. That is the provision in the bill and it not only relates to this, but relates to everything else in the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Therefore, the language of the present bill does not actually take care of the situation that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is directed to.

Mr. VINSON. I believe that if we could justify a negative decision on a proposal, the other body would probably go along with our viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there was a demand for a reading of the engrossed copy, would there be a vote on this bill tonight?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Michigan that such a question would arise in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole. Therefore, the Chair cannot pass on the gentleman's inquiry at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the committee realizes what discussion can be made about this matter in 1 minute, but I will use that 1 minute to make this brief statement.

If the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and others profess a great respect for the Army engineers that we all entertain, then why not adopt this amendment and end this question now as to whether or not the Army engineers ought to be disturbed. I would much

prefer to go further than this and write a direct exemption here with reference to the Army engineers because it's the one arm of this Government which enjoys the confidence and respect of every Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address you as a member of the Committee on Public Works to say that I regret very much that the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, whose judgment is respected so highly by the Members of the House, and who has taken such an active part in flood control and rivers and harbors work in the Congress for the last 20 years and who has been dealing with the Corps of Engineers during all of that time, was called away for a flood-control meeting in St. Louis, and as a result I know that he is missed in this debate by the Members of the House. Had it not been for the fact that our chairman made a previous engagement several months ago, he would have been here today. However, I do want to say that I have contacted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in regard to the section with respect to the Corps of Engineers under discussion, and that it is his opinion that, under the provisions of this legislation the Corps of Engineers are protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield my 1 minute to the next speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rogers amendment. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated the case exactly a moment ago when he said this issue ought to be decided now. Under the proposed bill, as it is presented by the committee and as it will be passed unless the Rogers amendment is adopted, you have a situation where if a reorganization plan involving the Corps of Army Engineers is submitted, you must take positive action to reject that proposal in both Houses, else the proposal will become operative and become a part of the reorganization plan. Under the Rogers amendment you are required to act affirmatively, in both bodies, upon the proposed reorganization plan. So you have this situation under the bill as the committee wants it passed: A proposed reorganization plan involving the Corps of Engineers might be deemed to have no merit and be rejected by the House, but the other body may not do so. Then the proposed plan becomes operative as a reorganization plan though the House has rejected it. The Rogers amendment corrects that situation and requires affirmative action by both Houses approving it before such a proposed plan can become operative. The amendment then is a guaranty that no amalgamation of the Corps of Engineers to the detriment of its performance can be effected.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sensitive of the need for reorganization legislation. At the same time, I am not unmindful of the magnificent work which has been performed by the Corps of Army Engineers. I express the deep concern which I feel that some misguided reorganization plan may affect this great organization. I think any plan which may affect the organizational integrity of the engineers would be a serious mistake and may hurt our defense establishment.

I have seen the Corps of Engineers work, both in war and in peace, and I feel that we have just the set-up which is most conducive to a well-trained and efficient Corps of Engineers. The country generally is satisfied that they are doing the job efficiently and wants no change.

I recognize that the Committee in drafting this measure was compelled to follow fundamental rules. The Committee did not wish to exempt any agency from the operation of this bill. But the Committee did prescribe that the engineers and other military organizations, if they are subject to reorganization under this measure, should be placed in a separate plan so that this body may cast a separate vote upon the plan submitted. I personally would like to go further and entirely exempt the Corps of Engineers. Since this is not now practical, I am going to accept the present language of the bill with the hope that the Senate may go much further in the degree of protection which it may give to an organization which has functioned since the very beginning of this Government with superb credit to itself and to our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to make a preferential motion, but, as stated once before, neither in committee nor on the floor of the House has there been the slightest inclination by anyone on this side to in any way delay or hinder consideration or passage of this legislation.

As a matter of fact, if I judge the sentiment on our side correctly, I know of no one who opposes the principles laid

down in this bill. There are those of us who do object to the method but we are not disposed to start a filibuster, but here is an amendment that has been offered. Some of the Members want to talk about it—but are being denied the opportunity. Now, what does this amendment provide? Who now is afraid? And of what?

I spoke earlier, and I will speak later on, if occasion requires, about an amendment which will not only enable but will force the House and the other body to act one way or the other, vote up or down, any and every plan which may come down from the Executive Office.

This particular amendment seeks to make it certain that the engineers cannot be put out of business without the consent of the Congress. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]—and I have the highest respect for his judgment and for his opinion—he, it may be said, if I might use such language on the floor, has been the daddy or the guardian of the Navy. Now he has assumed the same role, and I know of no man better qualified to take it, of all the armed forces. What he was afraid of was that if this bill went through without the amendment which he put in during consideration by the committee—requiring that any plan having to do with the armed services should come up in one package—he was afraid that by the inaction by either branch of the Congress it might go through and something might be taken out of the National Defense Establishment.

I fear he may wake up some fine day—I believe he will, if he does not watch his step—and learn that legislation affecting the Engineers, putting them out of their civil functions, will come up to the House. Then what happens? One Member of the House can bring it up and we will all vote on it. But suppose someone in the other body starts a filibuster or that no one there wants to take it up; there is nothing that can force them to take it up. We can vote the plan down; every Member in the House can vote against it; but unless we find some way of making the other body act, the plan will still be the law of the land and the Engineers or any other agency or function of an agency will be out of existence. It is that situation, it is that danger, that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] seeks to avoid.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Is not what the gentleman says true of every other reorganization plan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course it is; and that is why I want to preserve the constitutional method of legislating. I propose to offer an amendment which will compel this body and the other body to act before a plan can become a law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that this amendment if adopted would provide for this one agency of the Government an entirely different method of procedure as far as Congressional approval or disapproval is concerned?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I dislike to answer that because the answer will mitigate against the amendment I am going to offer later on applying the same procedure to all plans which may be sent down.

The situation is this: The first love of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the Navy, his second love is the Army, the third is the Engineers, and the Engineers, like the Marine Corps, have worked perfectly. No one wants to see the Engineers put out of business; but if we do not watch our step, and if perchance the other body should fail to act or not act in concert with us, then the civil functions of the Engineers might in some reorganization plan go out of the Department.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not a Senator have the same right to bring up legislation on the floor of the Senate that a Member of the House has in this body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; sure. But will he?

Mr. VINSON. Why should we treat the Corps of Army Engineers by a separate method of determination from the others?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just what you did with your amendment inserted by the Committee at your request as subdivision (b) of subdivision 6 of section 5 of the bill, when you provided for consideration of any plan affecting the "National Military Establishment."

Later, three other agencies were also given special treatment in reorganization plans.

I favor this amendment, because if I cannot get all I want I am willing to take what I can get to save one of our best agencies, the Engineers. Certainly any Member of the Senate could bring it up, but I ask the gentleman how long has the civil rights program been under consideration over there? Both parties are pledged to that program but strange, strange indeed, it has not been acted upon in that body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that on the preferential motion there are 5 minutes in support of the motion and 5 in opposition.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Corps of Army Engineers was started by George Washington, and was continued by every President of the United States right on down the line through Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, all having acquiesced in the good judgment of the first President. That is the reason for this furor here; that is the reason we want to see something done about the Corps of Army Engineers. We realize that it is necessary to keep these officers

busy in peacetime as well as in times of war. The peacetime accomplishments of these men are most beneficial to the Nation in an emergency.

What would result if the Corps of Army Engineers were to be thrown over into the Public Works Bureau? I will tell you what that would mean. It would mean a mammoth organization with one big head possessing more power than any official in the executive branch of this Government should have. So, Mr. Chairman, we ought to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. Let us write his amendment in.

It is an affirmative expression on the part of the Congress. Should the President send over a proposal to consolidate the Corps of Engineers with some other department we, in each House, would have only 60 days to reject such a plan. The 60 days pass in a hurry sometimes and because of other important matters pending in both Houses it is difficult to obtain a vote in both Houses. I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, while I must confess I do not exactly like the approach of the gentleman from Florida to this problem, I am going to support his amendment.

The Corps of Army Engineers has earned the gratitude and respect of all Americans. I am fearful of the pressure which has been exerted in the past and which is now being exerted to absorb the Corps of Army Engineers into some super-duper department of public works or to consolidate it with various agencies in the Department of the Interior. I am fearful of such a move. If it did happen I do not believe it would promote either economy or efficiency. The Corps of Engineers has accumulated an experience which is invaluable to the flood control and protection of this country.

I support, with reservation, his testimony insofar as the Corps of Army Engineers is concerned. I am naturally particularly concerned about the Corps of Army Engineers because I live in the city of New Orleans which is at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which drains about two-thirds of the United States of America.

We know first hand what floods are, what devastation can be wrought by the forces of nature when they are on the loose. We have lived with the Mississippi River since we have been a community and we are eternally grateful to the Corps of Army Engineers. In my judgment, there is no finer group of men in this great country of ours. They have been efficient; they have been capable; they have performed their duties without political favor or favoritism of any kind. They have been on the job in emergencies and they have accumulated, over a period of years, a tremendous amount of knowledge and experience.

I realize that we are faced with a quandary here when we talk about reorganizing the Government. Inevitably, some-

one appears before the responsible committee of Congress and asks that certain agencies be excluded.

I, too, favor—certainly in principle—all that this committee is attempting to do. It seems to me that the sprawling, overlapping functions of the Government must be consolidated in the interest of efficiency and economy; but in doing so I think that we must be careful not to interfere with agencies which have demonstrated, over a period of many years, their complete and total efficiency; and to my way of thinking there is no economy that could possibly be achieved by consolidating the Corps of Army Engineers with any other agency of the Government.

I do not know of anything else that I could add, Mr. Chairman, except again to say that we who have lived with the problem of flood control are immeasurably proud of the Corps of Army Engineers and we would be gravely alarmed if we felt that the Congress did anything which might jeopardize their efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I favor the adoption of this amendment. I do not believe that the Army engineers in the performance of their civil-functions work have been influenced by political considerations whatsoever. If this civil-functions work should be transferred to some other agency, as it has been rumored was in contemplation, I greatly fear that thereafter, such work would be subject to political considerations and political influence.

So far as I know, word has not come to Congress from the executive department as to what agencies or departments will be reorganized, changed, or abolished. I do know that rumors have been current that the civil-functions work of the Army engineers may be transferred to a new department to be created.

My own opinion is that this bill should provide that either House of Congress should be able to reject a reorganization plan, and that it should not require the concurrent action of both bodies. This bill, as it now stands, would require that it be rejected by both. That reverses ordinary legislative procedure. Today the civil-functions work may not be removed from the Army engineers except by affirmative action on the part of both Houses of Congress. If this bill passes in its present form, that will no longer be the case. The House may vote to reject such a plan, but mere failure to act on the part of the other body will result in a reorganization plan going into effect.

This seems to me to be an acknowledgment that Congress is no longer able to perform the functions belonging to it under the Constitution.

The Rogers amendment will require that both Houses must concur in order to remove these functions from the engineers, and I favor this requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have found myself in a happier position than I am at the present time. I am told by the chair-

man of the committee handling this bill and by the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and by the majority leader that the Corps of Engineers is safe. I am also told by the sponsor of this amendment that if it passes they are also safe.

I have a very high regard for the Corps of Engineers and its ability. The members of that Corps are not only builders but in building they learn in peacetime the things that stand them in such good stead in war. Regardless of whether this amendment is passed or not, I feel that the Corps is safe under any interpretation. I hope so, and the civil functions will remain in their hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned with the Army Corps of Engineers and we believe it has been adequately taken care of under this bill that we have brought to the committee today for consideration. We know that the legislative language is good and we ask the House to stand by the committee and vote down this superfluous amendment because it is unnecessary. We urge the House to stand by its committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill if a reorganization plan is returned to the Congress and if the House approves it and the Senate disagrees, then we cannot interfere with the reorganization plan; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 82, noes 143.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: On page 7, line 8, strike out subsection (b).

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to provide the administration with power to reorganize the various agencies of our Government by grouping, consolidating, coordinating, and abolishing any of the agencies and bureaus so as to eliminate overlapping and duplicating efforts in the hope of reducing Federal operating expenditures and promoting economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of our Government.

Section 5 (b) of this bill is intended, by effect, to exclude four privileged agencies from the general operation and purpose of this proposed legislation. My amendment seeks to strike section 5 (b) so as



to make every Federal agency subject to the provisions of the reorganization plan.

During our campaigns this last summer and fall, most of us promised to come here and support a tremendously needed reorganization bill, and I had understood by the introduction of this bill that we would be afforded the opportunity to carry out that campaign promise. However, we are now finding that our reorganization bill has the same faults and defects as the 1939 and the 1945 reorganization bills—meaning that our pet agencies and bureaus are excluded from the provisions of this bill just as they have been excluded by former bills introduced for the same purpose. Of course, the Expenditures Committee uses more technical language and advises us that these four privileged agencies are not excluded, but explains that these four pets just do not come under the same kind of set-up. At the same time, we know that when these four particular privileged pets are allowed to come under the provisions of subsection (b), they are not to be treated as these other agencies of the Government under the reorganization plan; and, therefore, it can well be expected that there will be no reorganization of the, first, National Military Establishment; second, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; third, Interstate Commerce Commission; and, fourth, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Now, if I had a pet to be excluded from the provisions of this bill by being placed along with the four agencies under section 5 (b), it would be the choice of a majority of us—the civil engineers. This would be my pet because the civil engineers have petted the people of my country more than the other agencies. However, I can assure you that I have no Government-agency pets to be considered foremost to the people I represent.

It is my opinion that if we want to reorganize our Federal agencies, attempt to save money for the taxpayers of this country, and reduce the number of employees that we have on the payroll who are doing nothing more than drawing pay, we should make a straightforward attempt to do so at this time. All of us realize that there is nothing more permanent in Washington than temporary employment with the United States Government. We get up on the political platforms throughout our sections of the country and each of us holler to the top of our voices, "If you will send me up there to replace that fellow who has been representing you in Congress, I can assure you that I will lower the cost of our Government." As an attempt to live up to our promises, we come forth with a reorganization plan that should cover all Federal agencies; I am at a loss to know how four Federal executive department agencies have managed to become excluded by that great committee of ours known as the Committee on Expenditures. A few minutes ago when someone offered an amendment for the purpose of adding his pet agency to be included in the exclusions, the chairman of that committee said:

Is this Congress going to pass a bill that will get the job done; or are we going to put

in exclusions that will prohibit the President from having any power to reorganize the executive department of this Government?

My amendment adds no agencies to the list of exclusions that will cripple the efforts of the President and his administration to properly reorganize the executive agencies of our Government; but, to the contrary, this amendment, if adopted, will remove the four stumbling blocks that can only be classified as "privileged pets" of the Expenditures Committee with no more right to be excluded from the provisions of this bill than any other Federal agencies that we could mention.

Now, friends, if we want to vote for a reorganization plan, let us vote for it and not a subterfuge. You have a chance here now. By taking out subsection (b) of section 5, you will be treating every Federal agency just exactly alike.

I want to ask you: Why is the Securities and Exchange Commission left in here under subsection (b) as an exclusion to the provisions of this bill? Why is it excluded under subsection (b)? Is it more important than the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or many other Federal agencies that we could mention, or is it just somebody's pet?

Why is the Interstate Commerce Commission excluded from the organization purpose of this bill by being placed as a privileged agency under subsection (b)? This is the first time that I ever knew that organization had any political friends, but I can readily see that it has some friends somewhere on the Expenditures Committee.

Of course, it is not hard to see why the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is listed among the privileged few because that all-powerful organization spreads its politics throughout the Nation.

The National Military Establishment is excluded as a privileged agency, I presume, under the theory that someone might be criticized by some person back home who might think we were trying to hurt his organization.

All Federal agencies, including the Military Establishments, could stand some reorganization, if the voters and taxpayers are to be considered. The hiring of civilian employees in the Military Establishments is now and has been during the past 12 months increasing more than 166 persons per day. Exclusive of Military Establishments, the daily average increase for the Federal civilian agencies during the same time is 131—a total of 297 new Federal employees each day the sun rises.

Mr. Chairman, it is known by all, regardless of party affiliations, the ever-present need for making the changes suggested by this bill in the reorganization of the executive agencies of the Government, hopeful of limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions, but more than anything else, eliminating a duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions. Such need is not exclusive to all Federal agencies except four privileged ones—but is needed as much so in one agency as the

other. If an agency be perfect, needing no reorganization, why would that particular agency fear being scrutinized by the reorganization commission?

Mr. Chairman, it does not take debate on this amendment issue. If you actually want to curtail expenditures of the Federal Government, which the Republicans have gone out and declared the Democrats were not attempting to do; and if the Democrats want to retaliate with some sound action and bring about a saving of needless Federal expenditures, we have a chance to do it now. If we merely want to appease the people with a camouflage, then vote against my amendment. After viewing the success of other efforts to amend this piece of proposed legislation, I do not expect you to pass the amendment anyhow because I see that the Expenditures Committee is certainly running the show here now.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TACKETT) there were—ayes 58, noes 149.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

#### TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

#### DEFINITION OF AGENCY

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department,

commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

#### MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act, the term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

#### SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function affected by a reorganization under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization effected by such plan or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

#### UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

#### PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

#### TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered ——— transmitted to Congress by the President on ———, 19—, the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a

reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

On page 8, line 5 strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof "either House a."

On line 6, strike out the words "the Congress" and insert in lieu thereof, the word "it."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, even at my age, there is no law against indulging in what might be termed a little flirtation if it be harmless. I have been listening to what might be termed either the orders, the blandishments, or the advice of some Members who, I hope, are my friends, and who sit to my right. They found some fault with the broader amendment which I proposed to offer and they persuaded me—or at least I am doing it—to offer this amendment. All this amendment does is to preserve half of the Congressional power to legislate. All it requires is that when the President sends a plan here it will not become the law of the land if either House of the Congress puts through a resolution disapproving it, saying that it does not approve of the plan. I hope my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have not led me astray and that they are not going to leave me out on a limb.

I hope—I would almost say I pray—that they will remember the words of advice which they have been giving me during the past week and again today when some suggested that this amendment would probably go through the House and that the prerogatives of the House would be preserved and that the duty of the House to legislate would still rest upon us to act on a plan within a certain time after the President sent it to us.

I hope—oh, I hope—that I have not been deceived, gentlemen. I hope you are going to go along with me on this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield. Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment merely provides



that any reorganization plan goes through unless the House votes that it should not go through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the same thing applies to the Senate.

Mr. VORYS. That is it, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. That is all it provides. It leaves it to the House, and the reorganization plan will go through unless the House says it should not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. In that way the Members who have been fearful concerning favored organizations will have their chance if their organization is to be damaged to have their say before the House and we can thus preserve the responsibility of the House in legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. If the friends of the Engineers or of any other group think that something is going to be done to their pet, if you want to describe it that way, or if you want to express it more accurately, if something is going to be done which they think should not be done, then the House can vote it down. It can just say, "We do not approve of that legislation."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the absence of this amendment, any plan proposed by the President, approved by the Senate, or a plan in respect to which the Senate took no action whatever, would become the law of the land, even if every Member of this body were opposed to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The House might vote unanimously to reject a plan and yet unless this amendment goes through it would be the law of the land if the other body did not act.

I am just asking for half a loaf, and for the support of those who advised me to take this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell a story that I think will illustrate the point that this amendment simply ruins the effectiveness of this bill.

A certain colored man down in Georgia had caught a large channel catfish. Let me say to you that unless you have eaten a channel cat, freshly caught and fried in deep fat, and unless you have had some hushpuppies to go along with it, you do not know what real eating is. Well, this colored gentleman had caught a big catfish and he was trying to skin that catfish. The catfish was floundering around, and finally finned him. The colored man said, "Catfish, what are you trying to do?" He said, "Quit that floppin' around." He said, "I ain't trying to do a thing but gut you."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not trying to do a thing but gut this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, after he guts the catfish nobody is going to eat it.

Mr. LANHAM. Now, my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], asked me in the debate earlier in the day why it was that Congress itself could not reorganize the executive agencies of the Government, and he agreed with me that I was right when I said that these executive agencies and their friends gang up on them. Now, you are making it possible for them to gang up now, and they will not have to fool with us in the House at all. They will simply gang up over in the Senate where there are only 96 men to try to influence, and they will give us the go-by sure enough.

If you want to hinder reorganization, if you want to block it and stop it, although you say you are for it, then you should vote for this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, irrespective of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has offered his amendment in good faith, in my opinion the adoption of this amendment for all practical purposes, would mean the ineffective operation of any reorganization bill. This amendment was very seriously considered in the committee. Furthermore, the last reorganization bill carried substantially the same provision as is contained in this bill. Agreeing with my friend in his unique story about gutting the catfish, this amendment, while not intended as such, will bring about the result that this bill will be gutted. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be gutted just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in this amendment we are faced with the real question of whether or not we want to continue the long-standing and tested legislative procedure, whereby no action under the authority of Congress is taken without the approval of both Houses of the Congress. Nothing else ever becomes law or goes into effect unless both Houses of Congress approve. Why should a reorganization plan? A hundred bills a year are passed by this House which are not adopted by the other body, and, of course, they do not become law. The same is true of bills passed by the other body but not by us. But under this bill as it now stands the President and one House of Congress can legislate, even though the other House expressly disapproves. It seems to me that as a matter of principle that is an extremely unwise thing to do. I do not believe any piece of legislation ought to be put into effect if one House disapproves. Do you? Does anybody really want a piece of legislation to go through that one House of Congress is opposed to?

Under this amendment the President sends down his bill with a plan for re-

organization. After 60 days it automatically goes into effect unless one House passes a resolution disapproving. If one House passes such a resolution, that does not kill the plan; it merely returns it to the President for him to make such modifications as will remove our objections. The debates here will tell him what part of the plan we do not like. He revises it and sends it back to us. It is precisely like the way we handle a conference report. If we do not like any part of a conference report, we reject it and it goes back to conference; the conferees revise it and bring it back until we can let it become law.

Three years ago, when I was privileged to be a member of this great Committee on Expenditures, I offered this same amendment in the last Reorganization Act, and it came within 14 votes of winning. It came up late in the session, later even than today, and we did not have a chance to explain it fully. I do not see how anybody can rightly object to this when he understands it. Surely we do not want to delegate to one House of Congress and the President the power to enact laws.

Under this legislation we do not authorize the President to reorganize; we authorize him to prepare a plan of reorganization. He is in better position than we to prepare a plan. We want the President to take the lead—he has to—in suggesting specific reorganization steps. But reorganization is a legislative function and therefore our responsibility. We cannot rightly delegate to somebody else that responsibility without having a chance to look at it and have the final say before he can issue orders to put it into effect. Under the amendment, if either body for whatever reason seems to it adequate decides to pass a resolution within 60 days disapproving the particular plan the President has submitted, it goes back to him, he reworks it, brings it back in better form and it goes through.

The amendment cannot possibly gut the bill. It merely sticks to the basic system of government that we have had in this Republic for more than a hundred and fifty years whereby the two Houses of Congress and the President legislate, not the President and one House of Congress. What is wrong with that?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the amendment is not adopted it means, does it not, in effect that one House of Congress and the President alone can legislate without the other House?

Mr. JUDD. Precisely; and that is exactly what I believe ought not to be done. If I felt sure the President would always send us what I personally would regard as the best reorganization plans ever devised, I still would be opposed to a system where the House could not hold it up if a majority should think it unwise.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time this particular amendment has been presented to the House, when a reorganization plan was proposed. This language which we have in the pending bill is the same language that was passed in the 1939 Reorganization Act and the 1945 Reorganization Act. Now, I am going back further, to the act of 1932, when Mr. Hoover was the President and his Attorney General was William B. Mitchell. In discussing this particular amendment which has been offered here today, it said:

If either branch of the Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval.

In discussing that particular amendment, he said:

It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were Executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him; and so there was set up a method by which one house of Congress might disapprove Executive action. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make that order provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. But to attempt to give either house of Congress by action which is not legislative power to disapprove administrative acts raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision in the act of June 30, 1932, for executive reorganization of the governmental functions.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. But the situation he was describing was not at all comparable to the one we are discussing. He ruled that it was probably unconstitutional for one house of Congress to make null and void an Executive order issued by the President, and I agree. But this bill does permit Congress to nullify Executive orders, it does not in the first instance authorize the President to issue orders effecting reorganization and then submit the orders to Congress for approval or disapproval. It authorizes him to prepare a plan and submit that to Congress. He will have issued no orders. We will merely be enacting or not enacting into law the plan he submits. Only after 60 days have gone by without disapproval of the plan by the Congress does the plan become law and he have authority to issue Executive orders. We debated that when reorganization was under consideration in 1945, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sumners, the eminent jurist who was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said the two situations were not alike. He said:

Attorney General Mitchell rendered an opinion that an Executive order made under the grant of legislative power could not be vacated or set aside by any congressional action short of legislation. It is perfectly apparent to the Membership of the House that this bill was drawn with the view of naming the President as the ministerial agent of the House rather than vesting in him legislative power, and therefore the provision contained in this bill whereby Congress may vacate any action taken by the

President by concurrent resolution is perfectly valid, because it is a condition subsequent and is a part of the law itself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize the gentleman's position and he has had 5 minutes to sustain it.

Mr. JUDD. But the situations are not similar.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is some question as to the constitutionality of the amendment which has been offered. The House by its action today will confer upon the President certain powers, delegating him to do certain things within limits. No one has attacked the constitutionality of that. Likewise when the plan comes back to the Congress the action of two Houses in disapproving it is just as important as the action of two Houses in approving. The gentleman's amendment does exactly what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] said, in my opinion. You know, you can always get one side of the Congress to agree for certain reasons to obstruct an act.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe it is wise for legislation to be passed that one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; the amendment provides that the President will be empowered to carry out the plan and to issue directives and orders under the plan only if within 60 days neither House has disapproved. If neither House has disapproved, it goes on its way. If one House disapproves within 60 days he has to take the plan back.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You are conferring upon one House legislative functions in fact.

Mr. JUDD. No; we are preventing one House alone from exercising legislative functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under the bill presented by the committee it requires the action of both Houses to disapprove.

Mr. JUDD. That is true. But many of us believe we should stick to the basic system in our Constitution under which action can be taken under the authority of the Congress only if both Houses approve—that is, if neither disapproves. Let me read you what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said when this was before us previously:

If it is within the competency of Congress to provide for vacating a plan that might be submitted under the bill by the President, by a concurrent resolution; it is of course equally within the right of Congress to provide that the order might be vacated by a simple resolution of either body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee of the Whole stand behind the committee on this and vote down the amendment as it will nullify the whole act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my colleagues a little story, about an occasion that happened, I think in 1940, in connection with what was then Reorganization Plan No. 3. That reorganization plan, among other things, abol-

ished what was known as the Air Safety Board. Very shortly thereafter occurred a series of air accidents, something like 28 or 30 in number. In the course of that time the House appointed what was known as the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents. I believe I am the only Member of the House today who was a member of that select committee. The accident near Atlanta, Ga., in which our own beloved colleague and friend, Bill Byron, of Maryland, was killed, and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacher seriously injured, pointed the need for a congressional investigation.

We proceeded to investigate 28 air accidents. It was considered at first by that committee, and I concurred in the thought, that abolition of the Air Safety Board had nothing to do with the accidents, but the further we went into it the more we became convinced that its abolition did have something to do with it. I bring that up only for one reason. When that reorganization plan was brought before the House of Representatives, the House by a very substantial majority voted its disapproval of that plan. I cannot now just remember whether the Senate did not concur with the House or whether no action whatever was taken in the other body. But, at all events, with the complete disapproval of the House, that plan nevertheless became law. Since then we have tried to arrive at some reasonable conclusion in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that would provide for a new Air Safety Board. The difficulties have been great. Perhaps, administratively, it is now being corrected. I trust it is. But, there was one serious instance when the House of Representatives by a considerable majority disapproved of a Presidential plan for reorganization largely because of the abolition of the Air Safety Board, and it became law nevertheless. We believed in our select committee unanimously that the Air Safety Board should not have been abolished. We could not do a thing about it in the House, because while we had disapproved its abolition, the plan nevertheless became law.

It seems to me that the House of Representatives is capable of judging the rightness or the wrongness of any plan for reorganization just as well as any other body in the Congress, and I think for myself that we should retain here the right to approve or disapprove any of those plans, regardless of any other agency of the Government. I think if we do not do that, that we will be giving away a very important part of our rights as representatives of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 95, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee may return to page 6 of the bill in order that I may offer a correcting



amendment which is not at all hostile to the purposes of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 6, line 1, after the word "for" strike out the words "winding up" and insert the word "terminating."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. Since debate will undoubtedly not change any votes, I ask for a vote on the amendment upon the conclusion of its reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 8, in line 3 of subsection (c) of section 6, after the semicolon following the word "it", strike out the words "but only if" and insert in lieu thereof the words "provided that" and in line 5, strike out the word "not" and in line 6 strike out the word "not." In line 7 after the word "plan" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following words, "provided further that the Congress shall, within such 60-day period, either approve or disapprove of such reorganization plan."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following

amendment: On page 8, after the word "by" strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert the words "either House a"; and in line 6 strike out the words "the Congress" and insert the word "it."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 9, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—358

Abernethy	Crawford	Hays, Ark.
Addonizio	Crook	Hays, Ohio
Albert	Crosser	Hébert
Allen, Calif.	Cunningham	Hedrick
Allen, Ill.	Curtis	Heffernan
Allen, La.	Deague	Herlong
Andersen,	Davies, N. Y.	Heseltun
H. Carl	Davis, Ga.	Hinsaw
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Tenn.	Hobbs
Andresen,	Davis, Wis.	Hoeven
August H.	Dawson	Hoffman, Ill.
Andrews	Deane	Holifield
Angell	DeGraffenried	Holmes
Arends	Delaney	Hope
Aspinall	Denton	Horan
Auchincloss	D'Ewart	Howell
Bailey	Dollinger	Huber
Barden	Dolliver	Hull
Baring	Dondero	Irving
Barrett, Pa.	Donohue	Jackson, Calif.
Barrett, Wyo.	Doughton	Jackson, Wash.
Bates, Ky.	Douglas	Jacobs
Bates, Mass.	Doyle	James
Battle	Durham	Javits
Beall	Eberharter	Jenison
Beckworth	Elliott	Jenkins
Bennett, Mich.	Elston	Jennings
Bentzen	Engle, Calif.	Jensen
Biemiller	Evins	Johnson
Bishop	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Blatnik	Feighan	Jones, Mo.
Boggs, Del.	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Boggs, La.	Fenton	Judd
Bolling	Fernandez	Karst
Bolton, Md.	Fisher	Karsten
Bolton, Ohio	Flood	Kearney
Bonner	Fogarty	Kearns
Bosone	Forand	Keating
Boykin	Ford	Kelley
Bramblett	Frazier	Keogh
Breen	Fugate	Kerr
Brehm	Furcolo	Kilburn
Brooks	Gamble	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Garmatz	King
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Kirwan
Bryson	Gavin	Klein
Buchanan	Gillette	Kruse
Buckley, Ill.	Gilmer	Kunkel
Burke	Golden	Lane
Burleson	Goodwin	Lanham
Burnside	Gordon	Larcade
Burton	Gorski, Ill.	LeCompte
Byrnes, Wis.	Gorski, N. Y.	LeFevre
Camp	Gossett	Lemke
Cannon	Graham	Lesinski
Carlyle	Granahan	Lind
Carnahan	Granger	Linehan
Carroll	Grant	Lodge
Case, N. J.	Green	Lowry
Cavaicante	Gregory	Lucas
Chatham	Gross	Lyle
Chelf	Gwinn	Lynch
Chesney	Hagen	McCarthy
Christopher	Hale	McConnell
Chudoff	Hall	McCormack
Church	Edwin Arthur	McCulloch
Clemente	Hall	McDonough
Clevenger	Leonard W.	McGrath
Coffey	Halleck	McGregor
Cole, Kans.	Hand	McGuire
Cole, N. Y.	Harden	McKinnon
Colmer	Hardy	McMillan, S. C.
Combs	Hare	McMillen, Ill.
Cooley	Harris	McSweeney
Cooper	Hart	Mack, Ill.
Corbett	Harvey	Mack, Wash.
Cotton	Havenner	Madden

Magee	Philbin	Stefan
Mahon	Phillips, Calif.	Stigler
Mansfield	Phillips, Tenn.	Sullivan
Marcantonio	Pickett	Sutton
Marsalis	Poage	Tackett
Marshall	Polk	Talle
Martin, Mass.	Poulson	Tauriello
Morrow	Preston	Taylor
Michener	Price	Teague
Miller, Calif.	Priest	Thomas, Tex.
Miller, Md.	Quinn	Thompson
Miller, Nebr.	Rabaut	Thornberry
Mills	Rains	Tollefson
Mitchell	Ramsay	Trimble
Monroney	Redden	Underwood
Morgan	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
Morris	Reed, N. Y.	Vinson
Morrison	Rees	Vorys
Morton	Regan	Vursell
Moulder	Rhodes	Wadsworth
Multer	Ribicoff	Wagner
Murdock	Rich	Walter
Murphy	Richards	Weichel
Murray, Tenn.	Riehlman	Welch, Mo.
Nicholson	Rodino	Werdel
Nixon	Rogers, Fla.	Wheeler
Noland	Rogers, Mass.	White, Calif.
Norblad	Rooney	Whitten
Norrell	Sadowski	Wickersham
O'Brien, Ill.	St. George	Wigglesworth
O'Brien, Mich.	Sanborn	Williams
O'Hara, Ill.	Sasser	Willis
O'Neill	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
O'Sullivan	Scudder	Wilson, Okla.
O'Toole	Sikes	Wilson, Tex.
Pace	Simpson, Ill.	Winstead
Passman	Simpson, Pa.	Withrow
Patman	Sims	Wolverton
Patten	Smathers	Wood
Patterson	Smith, Kans.	Woodhouse
Perkins	Spence	Woodruff
Peterson	Staggers	Worley
Pfeiffer,	Stanley	Yates
William L.	Steed	Zablocki

NAYS—9

Mason	O'Konski	Short
Nelson	Rankin	Taber
O'Hara, Minn.	Shafer	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—66

Abbt	Harrison	Sabath
Bennett, Fla.	Herter	Sadlak
Blackney	Hill	Scott, Hardie
Bland	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott,
Bloom	Jonas	Hugh D., Jr.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kean	Secret
Bulwinkle	Kee	Sheppard
Burdick	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Canfield	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.	Lichtenwalter	Somers
Celler	Macy	Stockman
Chiperfield	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, N. J.
Coudert	Meyer	Towe
Cox	Miles	Velde
Davenport	Murray, Wis.	Walsh
Dingell	Norton	Welch, Calif.
Eaton	Pfeifer	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Joseph L.	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Plumley	Whittington
Fulton	Potter	Wier
Gary	Powell	Young
Gore	Rivers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Canfield.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Kean.  
Mr. Secret with Mr. Macy.  
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Towe.  
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Sadlak.  
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Coudert.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lichtenwalter.  
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Meyer.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Blackney.  
Mr. Cox with Mr. Chiperfield.  
Mr. Harrison with Mr. Eaton.  
Mr. Somers with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Engel of Michigan.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Case, of South Dakota.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. Gore with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Welch of California.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.  
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Herter.  
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Keefe.  
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Martin of Iowa.  
Mr. Bland with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.  
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Hill.  
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Fulton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, let us no longer tolerate the bestial, uncivilized conduct of the Soviets and their puppets. We cannot afford longer to appease and temporize with palpable conspiracies against this Nation and the cause of human freedom everywhere.

Shall no voice of protest be raised by this Government against this latest outrage against Christianity and democracy? We should officially protest this persecution, this unspeakable cruelty. If protests are unheeded, we should promptly withdraw diplomatic recognition. The time has come to act in defense of our freedoms and security.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts and resolutions.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. HORAN and Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. Davis of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

#### OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 84) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective February 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional basic compensation per annum to the following employees in the office of the majority leader:

1. Additional clerk, at the rate of \$100.
2. Assistant clerk, at the rate of \$300.
3. Stenographer, at the rate of \$100.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture needs a slightly different gearing toward better adjustment, but let us not strip the gears in the process. We must decide on an approach that will not ignore such important things as national economic security, the conservation of our agricultural resources and keeping them intact for any eventuality, and the social well-being of every American.

I shall from time to time point out some of the hazards of the present law governing price supports on basic farm crops. We should not become complacent after removing certain features of this legislation, such as the provision that permits support of basic farm prices at less than 90 percent of parity after January 1, 1950. That is only the beginning. Following that, we must provide a program that will help and encourage and be an incentive to the farmer to carry on genuine soil conservation practices, to adjust his production so that we can have high production, high agricultural income, along with protection against excessive imports to insure a high national standard of living, and a secure national economy.

We need the continuance of a 90-percent parity price support, especially on basic farm crops, to provide an incentive for the farmer to produce. But at the same time, we must provide the farmer the right kind of assistance so that he can make the needed adjustments for continued fuller balanced production but which will not necessitate huge expenditures to support prices.

With that in view, I have today introduced a bill which I am confident will provide the framework to do this, legislation which will direct the United States Department of Agriculture to move ahead in the only sane way there is to help the farmer solve these problems.

This legislation does not provide for reduced production, but rather for a better balance of production.

It provides for the farmer to receive technical and financial assistance so that he can convert his poorer, now uneconomic producing land to a safe, long-time economic production use. He will be able to increase the fertility of his land so that he can produce more and better crops at cheaper cost, and at the same time give his land the protection it needs for maximum conservation and profitable continued production.

This legislation does not call for new agencies. It provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to use the same agencies, namely, Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and PMA, and also enables him to direct such manpower for more concerted action in soil conservation and for balanced farm production.

What will it cost the taxpayer? Definitely not one cent more than is now being appropriated. In all probability in due time it will cost less than is now being appropriated for benefits to agriculture and in addition will save untold millions we will need otherwise to support farm prices. This legislation provides that the money being appropriated for agricultural conservation payments—between two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars a year—be used for genuine conservation and balanced production purposes.

Let us glance momentarily at some of the beneficial adjustments these payments could bring about. Farmers are now growing about 11,000,000 more acres of wheat than they did on an average from 1937 to 1946. Half of this increased acreage was made possible by using land which previous to that was in grass, and should go back to grass. The other half was made possible by using land which formerly was used for hay, and moisture conserving practices. At the same time, livestock numbers have gone down. We have 11,000,000 fewer head of sheep than we did in 1942. We have 5,000,000 fewer head of beef cattle. This does not account for the livestock losses occurring from the recent subzero weather and blizzard conditions which have attacked our western cattle country in the past few weeks. These are just two items in our maladjusted agriculture. We today have 5,000,000 more acres of soybeans than we had in the 1930's, more acreage in cotton, corn, and other basic crops—and all at the sacrifice of either our soil resources or other production. Is it any wonder we have an erosion problem and an unbalanced agriculture? And these are but a very few of the out-of-adjustment crops we are confronted with.

This needed adjustment could be brought about by an expenditure of but one-third of present conservation payments—or approximately \$100,000,000 a year, leaving the rest of these funds to serve additionally for conserving our soil resources and rebuilding the productivity of the rest of our land for any eventuality and making full economic use of every acre, whether it be for crops, livestock, fruit, or timber.

In brief, this legislation also provides for the joining together for a unified purpose the conservation work now be-



ing done by certain agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture—a recommendation being made by all persons who have investigated present conditions and understand the erosion and production problems in agriculture. This bill ties together the conservation payments of the Production and Marketing Administration and the excellent technical services being offered by the Soil Conservation Service to farmers in soil conservation districts embracing over three-fourths of our farmland. Furthermore, this legislation strengthens the necessary and proper approach by helping farmers work out their own farm problems through their soil conservation districts which are organized by farmers themselves under State law. The district activities are supervised by locally elected farmers. The Federal Government does not spend anything for salaries or expenses of these supervisors. Where such financial help is given directly to districts, it is being done by the various States in cooperation with this phase of our national conservation efforts.

All of us know that on a large share of our land its long-time economic and safe use demands carefully planned rotations. Bypassing these rotations is one of the chief contributors to today's agricultural maladjustment.

The 1945 census shows that about 403,000,000 acres of land was being cultivated annually. In addition, the census reported that there are about 47,500,000 acres of plowable pasture making a total of about 450,000,000 acres currently classified as cropland. According to our best authorities in agriculture, about 61,000,000 acres of this land are not suitable for cultivation. This land is now being bled of its fertility and topsoil and land we must save for a type of production which will not destroy it.

Of the total acreage now or potentially available for safe cropping in the United States—approximately 460,000,000 acres when certain conversions are made—around 25 percent is now being damaged at a rapid rate of erosion. On another 110,000,000 to 120,000,000 acres of cropland, erosion is proceeding at a less rapid but still serious rate.

If we allow this land destruction to continue for another 25 years at its present rapid pace, continue present rate of increase in population, how strong will we be agriculturally by 1975? Obviously, we will be much weaker. What if we are again faced with a world conflict at that time and are called on to feed ourselves and our allies? If an overflowing arsenal of food is as important at that time as it was in World Wars I and II, we will definitely fail unless we take more aggressive action to stop the loss of our irreplaceable soil resources.

In view of all of these factors, I consider that for a logical approach to this problem of helping farmers balance their production we must begin with the proper use and conservation of our soil and water resources. Using the facilities we already have in the Department of Agriculture, and making full use of the incentive program of conservation payments, in the legislation which I am in-

troducing, I request that in addition to the needed basic national land policy which most of us have discussed before and favor, the following be enacted:

That the funds appropriated for conservation payments be divided into three groups of payments.

First. That there be class A payments to be used to encourage farmers to convert the use of land after it has been in grain, row, or other soil-depleting crops two or more previous years. These payments shall be used to help the farmers convert this land, for a reasonable time, to non-soil-depleting uses such as meadow, hay, pasture, and woodland. This conversion will encourage the production of more livestock and less grain but will not reduce the farmers' income. At the same time, it will encourage better land use, help to reduce erosion, and will greatly help to rebuild the fertility of our priceless soils. The payment shall be largest on the first year of conversion and on a reduced basis for the succeeding 5 years.

Second. That there be class B payments which shall be made for practices and other improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, such as terrace systems, drainage and irrigation installations, retirement of eroded cropland, farm ponds, range water diversion systems, and for other practices as may be needed to prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land.

After 1952, class A and B payments shall be made only when land conversion or when such practices or improvements are carried out as part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator.

Third. That there be class C payments which shall be made for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility, such as liming, fertilizing, grass seeding, crop rotation, cover cropping, mulching, and prevention of stubble burning. Such payments shall be made annually.

In brief, the foregoing and following are the major features and basic consideration which have brought about the introduction of this legislation. By its enactment, we will—

1. Establish a national land policy which will provide as a basis for agriculture's balanced production the conservation and proper use of our agricultural resources.

2. Achieve success in adjusting agricultural production for a high standard of living.

3. Protect our agricultural and national economy against bankruptcy.

4. Recognize the interdependency between a productive agriculture and a productive industry for national prosperity.

5. Help farmers to achieve greater success in soil and water conservation which will contribute extensively toward the agricultural security of our Nation.

6. Give to the American farmer the type of assistance he wants and needs—technical help he cannot obtain otherwise—and make it available through his locally farmer organized and administered soil conservation district.

7. Enable the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain greater farmer and national benefits from conservation payment funds.

8. Bring about a new era in American agriculture, which will lead to a more productive agriculture and industry, and give a permanent insurance for the preservation of our form of government.

#### OBJECTORS' COMMITTEE ON THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the appointment of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], being the ranking member, is chairman of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, numerous references have been made to alleged mandates growing out of the recent election. I think an analysis of the issues and the vote clearly show that no specific mandate on legislation was voted by the people.

Mr. Speaker, there is, however, one continuing and compelling mandate and responsibility resting upon this Congress which demands highest priority over any so-called legislative mandates from the November election. That mandate placed imperative responsibility upon the members of this Congress to keep this country sound financially.

It far transcends the call for additional billions of dollars for new legislation by the pressure groups. If they were made to understand their requests for constant greater appropriations may jeopardize the financial solvency of this country, they would cease to exert such pressure.

The Communists within our gates are the only ones who want to wreck the Nation financially, destroy the value of all of our Government bonds, wreck the banks, insurance companies, and destroy the credit of the Nation which would bring about chaos and the triumph of communism in this country.

That mandate and responsibility, when this Government was formed, was written into the Constitution of the United States at Philadelphia in 1787 and was regarded as one of its most important provisions. It is still in there, and its importance has grown with age.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate I refer to placed upon the Congress, and not upon the Chief Executive, the responsibility

and the sole power to levy taxes with which to finance our Government. That provision was so important it provided that all tax legislation should originate in the House of Representatives, the Members of which were regarded as being the representatives subject to the most immediate control of the people. Their terms of office were fixed at 2 years so that if they failed to properly represent the people, they could be turned out of office at the next election.

The members of the Constitutional Convention all regarded the taxing power of great importance to the financial solvency of the Government. Thomas Jefferson well defined the thinking of those who wrote the Constitution on this particular subject when he made the statement, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

That immortal statement is as true today as the founders of our Constitution held it to be at that time. Our responsibility to maintain a sound fiscal policy in these chaotic times when we are carrying a national debt load of \$252,000,000,000 should rest more heavily on the conscience of each Member of this Congress today than ever before.

Nothing is more important to the well-being of the people of this Nation and of the world today, than that this Congress, with the cooperation of the Chief Executive, see to it that this Nation is kept in a sound financial condition.

Fifteen billion dollars appropriated in this session of Congress for national defense, \$6,000,000,000 for compensation and care of veterans, almost \$2,000,000,000 for agriculture, billions for social security, and all of the \$42,000,000,000 we are asked to appropriate will mean nothing unless we keep the Government sound financially. We must keep this Nation strong against any eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, Lenin, the founder of communism, 30 years ago proclaimed the philosophy that capitalistic forms of government would eventually spend themselves into financial bankruptcy and become an easy prey to communism. Stalin in recent years has predicted that the United States would spend itself into financial bankruptcy. They have been anxiously waiting for this to happen. The Communists in this country have the same fervent hope and expectation.

May I emphasize this point: The Members of this House who face legislation to constantly expand the cost of Government, not only have the responsibility, but they have the power, and it is their duty, to stop the enactment of unnecessary legislation which will add billions of dollars of expense to the cost of Government each session. They also have the power, and should use it, to greatly reduce the cost of Government. I hope, in this session, the Members of this Congress will rise to their responsibility and prevent every possible waste in Government. We should reduce appropriations, rather than increase them.

With the tremendous debt hanging over the people, and the possible threat of another war, it seems most unfortunate that the President has recommended to the Congress a volume of new legislation which, if enacted into law by

this Congress, will add several billion dollars annually to the present debt load, and will increase as the programs are put into operation, billions of dollars each year. Some have estimated that the legislation recommended by the President will require possibly \$10,000,000,000 additional each year in taxes. We cannot carry such an additional tax load.

The President has asked a direct tax raise of \$4,000,000,000, plus about \$2,000,000,000 more money for social security. His budget request for \$42,000,000,000, if it can be held to that for the coming fiscal year, amounts to \$283 for each man, woman, and child in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the desirability of any of the requests for new legislation. Even though some of them may be justifiable and desirable, little if any legislation requested is absolutely necessary. Take, for example, proposed legislation for socialized medicine, federalized or socialized housing; great expansion and extension of river valley power developments; the spending of \$500,000,000 to develop the St. Lawrence seaway; universal military training costing more billions; and many other projects. None of them are absolutely necessary at the present time. We grew to our present strength, fought and won the last war without any of them.

The Federal Government is being called upon for billions of dollars for grants-in-aid to States, when the State treasuries are generally in much sounder condition than is the Federal Government.

#### WHO IS THE GOVERNMENT?

One hundred and forty million people and their property make up the Federal Government. It consists of some 40,000,000 families. The Government is not some particular agency in Washington that is supposed to take care of the people and support them; the people support their Government with the \$42,000,000,000 in taxes asked from them by the President for the coming year.

The Government should operate like a family. If the farmer is heavily in debt and has a Ford car for the family's use, his son may want him to buy him a new Cadillac; the wife and daughters might like to have a new piano, additional and more expensive electrical appliances and clothes. They do not have to have them, but it would be nice if they could. The conservative, sensible farmer will think of his debts that he must reduce, and he will refuse to be pressured into increasing his debts by a few thousand dollars more, but will take his surplus cash and reduce his debts or mortgage. The Congress must protect the Government in the same sensible way; we must not spend billions for things we can do without. We must reduce the national debt instead.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is in debt today as never before. Millions of our people have loaned the Government billions of dollars through their purchase of Government bonds. We need to reduce the debt and keep those bonds at par value. We cannot do it if we permit the many pressure groups to get their hands into the Federal Treasury and take more and more billions out of the

Government. This thing has got to stop before it is too late; this Congress can and should stop it.

Unfortunately, the President promised too much in additional services and extra hand-outs to the people during the heat of the recent campaign. Nearly all of the promises made by the President are now being formulated into legislation which, of course, will keep his political campaign promises. If they are kept, some will benefit temporarily; yet, all of the people eventually will lose.

This Eighty-first Congress will have to decide whether it will enact into law a volume of new legislation recommended by the President which will add to the cost of government many billions of dollars annually for years to come, or whether it will adopt a policy of economy in government, refuse to enact any unnecessary legislation, cut the cost of government, and reduce the Federal debt by many billions of dollars annually. I believe a great majority of the people want us to embark upon a policy of economy, rather than to vote additional unnecessary billions which will make it necessary to increase taxes. We can well afford to wait until we are better able to pay for additional projects and services.

Mr. Speaker, it seems significant that the President in his message to the Eighty-first Congress put no emphasis on economy in Government. Instead he recommends a broad legislative program that able economists who have made a study of it claim will cost the Government over \$100,000,000,000 within the next 10 years; that it will compel an increase in taxes of between 19 and 27 percent. They claim that it will increase taxes by 1950, if all legislation is approved, by \$26,000,000,000, which added to the present \$42,000,000,000 would make the annual tax load \$68,000,000,000 for 1950.

The \$42,000,000,000 budget for the coming year requested by the President will cost the taxpayers and residents of Illinois alone \$3,300,000,000 for its share in the cost of the Federal Government. This will take from my State, seven times all property taxes collected for all State and county governments in Illinois in 1948. It will take from the taxpayers of Marion County, where I live, \$14,358,000. This is nine times as much as the \$1,788,000 paid in Marion County in 1948 to cover the cost of all schools, city, and county governments.

It will take from Saline County in my district \$9,603,000 as that county's share of the \$42,000,000,000 budget requested by the President. This is over nine times as much as the \$1,001,000 paid in Saline County in 1948 to cover the cost of schools, city and county government. It will penalize all counties in my district in the same way.

The Eighty-first Congress has before it two great opportunities for service to the people. The first is to refuse to enact all proposed new legislation not absolutely necessary that will add extra billions to the cost of Government.

Its second opportunity is to reduce the cost of Government by \$4,000,000,000 and to defeat any attempt to increase taxes.



Unemployment is increasing every day. This proposed new legislation to increase taxes is one of the major reasons for the increase in unemployment. Businessmen will not risk their capital, stay in business, and expand it when they are threatened with a constant increase of taxes by the Federal Government. A tax policy that chokes the rewards of enterprise will destroy our prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest services that could be rendered to the laboring people of the Nation, and to everyone, would be to drastically cut the cost of Government at the present time, and reduce, rather than increase, our taxes. In fact, excise taxes such as the 25 percent tax on telephone and telegraph communications, and dozens of such taxes on items that are not luxuries should be greatly reduced, or wiped out completely. We should be reducing taxes, rather than even considering raising tax rates.

This is certainly not the time to spend additional billions on new legislation. This is not the time to add 4 or 6 billion dollars additional taxes onto the taxpayers and the economy of our Government. If we do, we may prove that Jefferson was right when he said "the power to tax is the power to destroy." If we do, and pass additional new and unnecessary legislation that will cost many billions annually for the years to come, we may destroy the financial solvency of this Government to the great delight of Stalin, Molotov, and their Communist followers in our country.

This Congress, if it has the courage to stand up against the pressure groups and do the things they know within their own conscience is right, can cut the cost of Government and effect other economies by over \$4,000,000,000.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has repeatedly called for a reduction of many thousands in Federal pay rolls. For the past 7 or 8 months, pay rolls have constantly increased. If we pass the legislation requested by the President, countless thousands of additional new pay-rollers will be added to the sprawling bureaucracy of this country. Their salaries will be a constant cost against the Government. Bureaucratic pay rolls should be reduced in this session of Congress by over 200,000 people at a saving of \$600,000,000.

This is a time when the Congress, yes, and the Chief Executive ought to be calling for a reduction in spending, instead of calling for an increase in spending and taxes.

The Hoover Commission authorized by the Congress to make a thorough study and bring in recommendations for the reorganization of the executive department of Government in an effort to stop waste and overlapping of bureaus and greater efficiency and economy in government, will soon make its final report.

The Commission has given out several partial reports. Every report indicates that billions of dollars can be saved, and greater efficiency accomplished if the full report, soon to be made to the Congress, is adopted.

Instead of enacting a broad and expensive program of new legislation that will add countless thousands to this bu-

reaucracy, why not wait till the next session of Congress until we have put the executive departments on an efficiency and economy basis, rather than add additional rooms and wings to the rambling bureaucratic structure we have today?

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren last week, in testifying before the House Executive Expenditures Committee in Washington, had this to say:

The Federal bureaucracy—

Now numbering over 2,000,000 persons—

is a Frankenstein monster, and an ideal system for tax eaters—attached to the public teat.

Further he said:

Our present Federal set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlapping, inefficiencies, and inconsequences.

As I have testified before—

Stated Mr. Warren—

at times it (the bureaucracy) arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress and openly defies it.

This comes from the Comptroller General of the United States, incidentally a Democrat, who is the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

We can cut billions out of this bureaucracy in salaries and waste, and I for one want to see the Congress move in that direction instead of increasing the taxes. The President's proposed new legislation will increase pay rolls and make more taxes necessary.

Mr. Speaker, every segment of the American people now in my opinion are carrying as heavy a tax load, from the humblest to the highest, as they should be compelled to carry. If this Congress follows the recommendation of the President to increase taxes in the higher brackets and on corporations, the little taxpayers and a part of the laboring crowd who approve such a policy, will find that they who earn and pay taxes on less than \$5,000 a year will have to pay at least two-thirds of this extra \$4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Big business is paying war times taxes now like all of the rest of us. When additional taxes are placed on business and the corporations, the cost of these taxes will be added to the cost of goods bought by the little fellows earning up to \$5,000 a year.

The millions of small taxpayers will pay about 64 percent of the \$42,000,000,000. This is true because there are so many more of them.

In addition to income taxes, they will continue to pay hundreds of hidden taxes that go into the cost of the clothes they wear, the houses they live in, or the food they eat, and never know the tax is being passed on to them in the price of merchandise after it is loaded on to business or the corporations in taxes by the Federal Government.

May I close my remarks by expressing the hope that the 435 Members in the House of Representatives will realize in this session of Congress, as never before, that they will serve their constituents best, and that they will serve themselves and the Nation best, if we will reduce

Government spending and prevent an increase in taxes.

The national defense of this country depends on keeping the Nation in a sound financial condition. If we fail as a nation financially, we cannot defend ourselves against any foe from within or without.

We cannot fully discharge our duty unless we reduce spending and cut the cost of Government. The time to act is now. It is later than we think. It is the responsibility of the Eighty-first Congress. It is the greatest challenge before you and the people that can come to this Congress. It may well mean the protection of your freedom and liberty for the future, and the preservation of our representative form of Government.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE UNITED STATES RICE INDUSTRY

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include statements, statistical material, and other matter in relation to the rice industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of Congress from the three southern rice-producing States—Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas—held a meeting with the officials of the Economic Adjustment Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and a statement was issued by those attending the meeting stating that in their opinion there was not too much cause for alarm in regard to the situation obtaining in the rice industry at this time.

The meeting was held largely to ascertain whether or not there was prospect of the Economic Adjustment Administration making purchase of approximately 1,000,000 pockets of rice from the United States under their allocation to China, and it was learned that because of the precarious situation existing as a result of the reverses of the nationalist government in China, these purchases have been deferred.

There are approximately 5,000,000 bags of rice of the 1948 crop in the hands of the growers and millers in the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. The Economic Adjustment Administration deferring the purchase of the allocation for China, and the fact that it is estimated that more than 50 percent of the remaining rice stocks in the States mentioned is of an inferior grade and poor milling quality, presents a major problem of distribution, and many of our growers and millers are becoming somewhat disturbed as to the sale of the remainder of the stock on hand, and while the world-wide demand for rice is in excess of the available supply at this time, the deferment of the purchase of rice for relief purposes in China by the Economic Adjustment Administration is deplored as the industry had anticipated the utilization of a large portion of the low grades in that program.

In previous years the Government has taken all of the low-grade rice and exported it on a price basis that would return to farmers approximately the same price that they received for the better grades; however, it must be borne in mind that conditions have changed and the Asiatic countries, which produced the major portion of the world supply prior to the war, were forced to reduce their production during the war to a point where the United States was called upon to expand their production in order to make up some of the deficit, and as a result of the scarcity of this product, prices for rice, like all other scarce commodities, increased in price comparable with prices prevailing during the First World War.

Other factors have now further changed the picture. Not only has the United States increased its production but a number of South American countries have expanded their production, and the Asiatic countries are now being rehabilitated, and they also are rapidly increasing their production, and from this time on the United States producers can look for a competitive market.

I think one of the best discussions of the situation in respect to commodity prices, including grains, hogs, and livestock is that by J. H. Carmichael, in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, February 6, 1948, which I am quoting, as follows:

Under the weight of huge supplies, commodity prices—particularly domestic farm products—are going through their second readjustment in the postwar period. Coming just a year after the first price break, which was followed with only moderate and intermittent rallies, the present decline generally has wiped out the sharp rises in the immediate postwar period and has brought a number of commodities even below the level fixed by the Office of Price Administration during the war.

Despite the intervention of the United States Government with its price-support measures, the trend of commodity prices seems to be following those of every major war in the last two centuries. A sharp upward trend for a year or two until production again could get under way always has been followed by a sharp decline. Because of this Government's activities, including its aid program abroad, most people and especially the farmers had been led to believe that there would not be any sharp deflationary trend after World War II.

The huge supplies and prospects of large yields this year are among the factors in the present price trend. On January 1 last stocks of the six major grain crops in the United States were 1,372,600,000 bushels larger than a year earlier. When this was announced on January 25, it caused the grain trade to wonder if the Government's support program could remain effective in the face of another near-record yield this year.

Under the present Agricultural Act, the United States Government is committed to make nonrecourse loans to farmers at 90 percent of parity. Normally, the loan level would be the "floor" price on any farm product. However, with corn, and also wheat in recent months, dropping below the loan level, the trade realized that it was not safe to count on Government support prices as the absolute bottom.

#### STORAGE SPACE SCARCITY FELT

Among the reasons why prices have not held at the loan levels is the lack of storage space. This has caused some distress selling

during the heavy marketing periods. In addition, many of the smaller farmers have sold their products in the open market rather than take the trouble involved in obtaining a Government loan. In some instances, the quality of a product is such that it will not qualify for a loan with the result that it is disposed of in the regular commercial way.

Another reason why support prices do not work in cases of abnormally large crops is that once a commodity has passed from the farmers' hands it enters the "free" supply and becomes subject to demand influences. Under the law the producer is the only person who may obtain a nonrecourse loan from the Government.

Probably the most important influence is the knowledge that there are excess supplies of all grains. The trade realizes that these ultimately will be made available, at least at loan redemption costs, and consumers are in no hurry to anticipate requirements very far in advance. Also, there is the further uncertainty as to when and at what price the Government will dispose of its loan holdings.

#### SUPPORT POLICIES A FACTOR

Further uncertainty involves the question of future farm price-support policies. The present support program of 90 percent of parity expires at the end of this year. Although a new plan providing for a sliding scale ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity then is scheduled to apply, an effort is being made in Washington to set future price-support levels at a rigid 90 percent of parity. However, there are reports that some compromise arrangement may be worked out that would satisfy those of the farm bloc who are insisting on a rigid 90 percent loan level.

Despite all the efforts being made to hold farm-product prices and the billions of dollars that are being expended directly and indirectly for that purpose, the action of the grain markets over the past year indicates that it requires more than Government support to stem an economic trend.

In January 1948, May wheat in Chicago reached \$3.06½ a bushel. In September, the May 1949 delivery sold at a low of \$2.11½ when the post-harvest movement of wheat to terminals was at its height. Subsequently the price recovered moderately, but recently declined to around \$2.15. However, July and September 1949 wheat have broken through the \$2 level.

#### BREAK IN CORN SPECTACULAR

The break in corn price has been more spectacular. From a high in 1948 of \$2.70½ a bushel, May 1949 corn futures late in the year dropped to \$1.39½. In the recent break, the price receded to around \$1.27, or less than one-half of a year ago. The record corn crop last year and the heavy post-harvest movement to market have resulted in that cereal dropping sharply below its loan level of \$1.56 a bushel at Chicago.

The heavy snows recently in the West, which have been accompanied by unseasonably low temperatures, have resulted in the deaths of a vast number of livestock, which will mean a lessened demand for corn for feeding purposes in the months ahead. In addition, the added moisture has improved the outlook for the present winter wheat crop.

For the first time since the end of the war, there are heavy surplus supplies of all important grains and the market simply is adjusting itself to the changed conditions. Had it not been for the support program, the decline probably would have been more drastic.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to quote a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post, also of date Sunday, February 6, 1948, entitled "Turn in the Tide" which also discusses prices for basic farm products, and which also states that the

downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm, as follows:

#### TURN IN THE TIDE

Government officials have been quick to point out that the current drop in employment and the downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm. So far, certainly, there is nothing to worry about in the rise in unemployment, which, judged by prewar standards, is still at low levels. Prices for basic farm products have already undergone a sharp deflation that has been salutary rather than otherwise, while the much-advertised drop in retail prices has been extremely limited, bringing living cost indices only three points below the peak level reached a few months ago.

The prevailing uneasiness is due chiefly to a belief, supported by an abundance of confirmatory evidence, that the period of scarcity and consequent booming prices is coming to an end. That had to happen sometime and there is good reason to be thankful that it seems to be taking place while employment and consumer incomes are still at high levels. However, the shift from an economy characterized by scarcity to a more normal peacetime economy of comparative abundance in which the seller no longer has the upper hand entails some hazards. As backlog demands for durable goods are satisfied, for instance, some industries have to curtail their operations, others feel the effects of seasonal declines in buying that were once taken for granted, and marginal high-cost firms may be forced out of business by inability to market their products at profitable prices.

Many of our farmers do not realize that, in respect to rice, the United States normally produces approximately 1 percent of the world supply of this commodity, and, in this connection, I wish to submit a table showing the production of rough rice for the 1947-48 crop year from the Commodity Yearbook as follows:

*Production of rice, 1947-48 crop year, from Commodity Yearbook*

	Bushels
United States.....	79,000,000
India.....	2,050,000,000
Burma.....	269,000,000
China.....	2,348,000,000
Japan.....	545,000,000
French Indochina.....	210,000,000
Philippines.....	109,000,000
Korea.....	129,000,000
Java and Madura (1946-47)...	250,000,000
Siam.....	143,000,000
Brazil.....	111,000,000

Estimated world total... 7,086,000,000

In addition to the countries included in the above and foregoing table, two other countries produced a large amount of rice. The figures given are for Mexico, which had a rough-rice production—1946-47—of 6,760,000 bushels; 1947-48, 7,300,000 bushels; 1948-49, estimated, 7,350,000 bushels. Guatemala produced in 1945, 544,000 bushels, and in 1948 produced 14,000 short tons.

Egypt and other countries are also increasing their production to a substantial degree. With these facts staring us in the face, it must be realized that we must evaluate the situation as it now confronts the United States rice industry.

With the end of the war and with changed world-wide conditions, while it is anticipated that the balance of the United States stocks of rice will be utilized at a price above the present parity price, we must realize that in the future, with increased production from the



Asiatic and other countries, the United States industry will find itself in a competitive market, and it is a known fact that we cannot produce rice to sell in competition with the Asiatic countries whose standard of living and cost of production is so far below that of the United States. Therefore, the question arises, What is the future of the rice industry in the United States?

The consumption of rice in the United States is only about 50 percent of the amount of rice produced in the United States, and the United States is able to produce a better grade of rice than are our competitors—the long-grain variety. Our principal export customer is Cuba and Cuba prefers long-grain rice rather than the lower grades. Therefore, the answer is hypothetical. We must either increase domestic consumption or reduce our production and plant only the higher quality of rice which is preferred not only by Cuba but by our domestic market. We will be unable to compete in a competitive market against the Asiatic countries as stated before due to the cost of production in the United States, even on the lower grades. Even at this time, the Asiatic countries can deliver a ton of rice to Canton, China, for \$190 per ton, whereas it costs \$225 per ton for United States rice.

Another question also arises in connection with our opportunity to export rice—as well as many other commodities. That is, many of the countries which might prefer to buy our products are now impoverished and do not have the dollars with which to buy. Notwithstanding all of this, in view of the information which we have from the Government officials and other informed sources, it is hoped that the United States industry will be able to dispose of the remaining stock of the 1948 rice crop at a price above the present parity price, as rice is selling in the present market at approximately 122 percent of parity, and there is not enough rice in sight to meet the world demand, and even though a major portion of the remaining crop is of a low and inferior quality, it is believed that customers will be found to buy and pay for the remainder of the 1948 crop on hand.

For the future some predict that it will be 2 or 3 years before Burma, Siam, and Indochina will be able to reach normal production; however, it is my opinion that those countries will increase production to such a degree by next year that this fact will affect the demand and sale of United States rice next year, and the only salvation for the United States industry is to curtail production of, and grow only the higher quality and best grades of rice this year and in the years to come. It has been proven that cattle can well and profitably be produced on rice lands, and since the same situation as respects competition does not exist in the cattle industry as will exist in the rice industry, it would seem a good idea for the rice farmers of the United States to hedge and play safe and reduce rice production and increase cattle production.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

XCV—59

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), on account of illness.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on February 3, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

167. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the first report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, relating to the general management of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

168. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the first semiannual report of all educational exchange activities carried on from July 1 to December 31, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

169. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

170. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

171. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of

Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$2,500 for the judiciary, Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

173. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised draft of a proposed provision and revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving a decrease of \$4,265,500 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

174. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

175. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to disposal of dangerous weapons in certain cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

176. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance relating to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel under Public Law 395; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

177. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Federal Security Agency during the period January 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. A letter from the secretary, United States Department of Justice, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the Fiscal Year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

181. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md."; to the Committee on Public Works.

182. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

183. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the sixteenth report to Congress by the United States Maritime Commission of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

185. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1661. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1432. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 24. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 25. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Engelbert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept.

No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadum; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

# PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2362. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 2363. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2364. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2367. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2368. A bill to provide for establishment of a soil- and water-conservation policy, the coordination of soil- and water-conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2369. A bill to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MCGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 2370. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2371. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance

system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments, increase the benefits payable under such system, lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries, and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2372. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2374. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2375. A bill to provide for the per capita distribution of certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2376. A bill to increase the deduction from gross income allowable for charitable and other contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2377. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure construction advances on single-family dwellings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2378. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2379. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2380. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2381. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2382. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2383. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2384. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2385. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount



Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2387. A bill authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2388. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2389. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2390. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or from any State maritime academy, who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2391. A bill relating to eviction of tenants from publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2392. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. D'EWARD (by request):

H. R. 2393. A bill to repeal section 9 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), relating to the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2394. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2395. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2396. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2397. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2398. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2399. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2400. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended,

and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2401. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of the State of California for reimbursement for moneys advanced and expended in aid of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2402. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2403. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 23 of the United States Code with respect to certain tort claims against the United States of persons who are minors or insane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2404. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2405. A bill to further amend the United States Code, title 28, section 239, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2406. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories; to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2407. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2408. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2409. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2410. A bill to limit and restrict the ownership and use of radio broadcast stations in chain or network broadcast service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2411. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Philips Inlet, Fla., with the intracoastal waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2412. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2413. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Basin Bayou and Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2414. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a boat basin and channel along Wayside Park at Thos. A. Johnston Bridge in Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2415. A bill to provide for the transfer for State park purposes of the land on

which Fort Gadsden, Fla., is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2416. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of extending the channel in the dock area at Carrabelle, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to improve recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2418. A bill to authorize restocking, propagation, and conservation of game in the Eglin Field Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 2419. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2420. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2421. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated over-all Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2422. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2424. A bill to provide for the purchase, construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, including armories, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2425. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2426. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2427. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2428. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2429. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide a standard for determining the continued absence of parents from home in cases of aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2430. A bill to change the method of computing Federal grants-in-aid to States for aid to dependent children, to authorize such grants-in-aid for aid to needy relatives who provide homes for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2431. A bill to amend section 202 (c) (2) of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase children's insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2432. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2434. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2435. A bill to amend sections 210 and 209 (f) of the Social Security Act so as to increase the benefits payable to veterans of World War II and their survivors, and to remove the 3-year limitation upon survivors' insurance benefits in the case of deceased World War II veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2436. A bill to amend the Service-men's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2437. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2438. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2439. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2440. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2441. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2442. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed, for income-tax purposes, for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2443. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of *The United States v. Doherty Executors*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 2444. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in northwestern Pennsylvania for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2445. A bill exempting admissions to activities of elementary and secondary

schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2446. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2447. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2448. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for the adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students and leaders in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution protesting against the prosecution and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing that, effective January 4, 1949, the compensation of the clerk of the official committee reporters shall be at the basic rate of \$4,000 per annum; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 83. Resolution to instruct the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake study of the effects of rent-control laws and formulate legislation granting financial re-

lief, in the form of subsidies, to landlords of residential rental units suffering financial loss from effects of inflation and rent ceilings; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Christ Nick Vans, alias Christos Nick Ventouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis D. Papapanagiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2453. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the silver star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Charlie Hales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Helen Morren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfonso Vidal y Planas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Rene Belbenoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Anna and Solomon Lagstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Irene Senutovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2465. A bill for the relief of John Keene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Hieronim Henry Kolodziejczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Lester John Skiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Mario Tiberi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. McDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Walt W. Rostow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2475. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Albert M. Lewis, Jr., certain land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2476. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, urging the Congress to take steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

46. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

47. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

48. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Jersey City, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the adoption of legislation now pending before the Congress relative to granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hallowed be Thy name. In our wayward hearts Thou hast implanted a love for truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice, and from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. May the lure of Thy beauty lift us above the mud and scum of mere things to the realm of the ex-

cellent and the lovely. In a deceitful world which offers its cheap and empty prizes, where each ounce of dross counts its ounce of gold, enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in the things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 7, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alten	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	O'Connor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Cain	Kerr	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Chapman	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Lodge	Sparkman
Cordon	Long	Stennis
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Douglas	McCarthy	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Tobey
Flanders	McMahon	Tydings
Frear	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hendrickson	Morse	Withers
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

#### VOLUNTARY PLANS COVERING ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance with the amendment and request, to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects, the requirements of the armed forces, and the requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REPORT OF MARITIME COMMISSION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 493, 77th Cong.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska favoring increase in the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUTLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN on February 7, 1949, p. 825, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to a series of four dams on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### "Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

"Whereas the building of the Eden project would increase to double its present size this farming community; and